

P A
3136
F6
1922
MAIN

UC-NRLF



B 4 028 884

The Use of Myths to Create Suspense in Extant Greek Tragedy

A DISSERTATION

PRESENTED TO THE

FACULTY OF PRINCETON UNIVERSITY
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE
OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

WILLIAM W. FLINT JR.



1885

1885

The Use of Myths to Create Suspense in Extant Greek Tragedy

A DISSERTATION

PRESENTED TO THE

FACULTY OF PRINCETON UNIVERSITY
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE
OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

WILLIAM W. FLINT JR.

Accepted by the Department of Classics
June 1921.

exchange

P. 3156
F. 6
1922
1922

FOREWORD.

The present study was originally intended to be part of a larger treatment of all the specific means to secure suspense employed by the Greek Tragic Poets. This, however, outgrew the scope of a Doctoral Dissertation. The author hopes to publish separately parts of the larger study.

The author's thanks are due to Professor Edward Capps of Princeton University, and to Mr. A. W. Pickard-Cambridge of Balliol College, Oxford, who have read the manuscript and generously given suggestions and assistance at every point.

ST. PAUL'S SCHOOL,
Concord, New Hampshire,
December 1, 1922.

THE USE OF MYTHS IN CREATING SUSPENSE.

By the word 'plot' we mean nowadays the bare abstract of the action of a play or story, like a summary of a game of chess. So we speak of an 'elopement plot', a 'jealous husband plot', and so on. The word *μῦθος* in Aristotle's *Poetics* appears in the process of change from the meaning it bears in Fifth Century prose, which is 'story', to a later meaning identical with 'plot'. Now 'story' means more than 'plot', for a story is about some one; there must be a Red-Riding-Hood, a Guenevere, or an Odysseus. Thus when Aristotle names *μῦθος* as one of six elements of tragedy (*Poetics* 1450 a 9), and says elsewhere that he intends to show *πῶς δεῖ συνιστασθαι τοὺς μῦθους* (*ibid.* 1447 a 9), the element of *μῦθος* means more than an impersonal skeleton of hypothetical events. It includes certain fictitious characters whose actions and dispositions are already to a degree fixed by existing tradition. Concerning the same characters there may be several traditions varying and even contradicting each other. A *μῦθος* has thus not the fixity of history. The duty of one who handles it afresh is not that of the historian, to discover among the variants one version and one only which is objectively true. So far from being a source of confusion, a wealth of divergent stories about the same characters is a clear advantage. From among them the poet may select or combine with an eye solely to the artistic worth of his creation, or to a moral which he wishes to illustrate.

The Greek tragic poets worked in a field of national legend, with characters and events already familiar to all or part of their hearers. Most of these myths were by the Fifth Century fairly well fixed in their main lines. But within these existed an endless diversity of localization, chronology, and minor detail, so that a poet, by combining different stories or by alluding to variants in the course of the action, could create a semblance of uncertainty as to the issue of his play. Occasionally, as in the stories of the end of Oedipus or of the career of Helen, the variants assumed the importance of flat contradictions on essential points. These variants may be divided into two main classes:

1) *Variants due to artistic elaboration by earlier poets within the recollection of the spectators.* These affect our question of sus-

pense to a limited degree, as will appear. In Aristophanes, *Ach.* 417 ff. Oeneus, Telephus, Phoenix, Philoctetes, Bellerophontes, and Thyestes are mentioned, each with some familiar individual characteristic. (See Demosthenes, *De Cor.* 180.) But in each case the character is something less or more than the same character in the saga. Here we have to do, not with the shadowy Philoctetes of a mysterious legend, but with the Philoctetes of Euripides, known by sight and voice to the audience. As the characters, so the play itself stood out in the mind of one who had seen it as a clearly outlined picture against a nimbus of poorly related incident and detail that was the ancient saga. Thus a poet who rehandled a theme familiar in contemporaneous literature had to guard against two things: a) following his model too closely for originality, b) diverging from his model where that model embodied a consensus of tradition, to depart from which would be unconvincing or shocking. Similarly the poets tended to avoid the stories of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, which lay already at hand in a highly artistic form, contained few incidents big enough for independent development (as Aristotle remarks, *Poetics* 23), and were fixed in the minds of every Athenian audience. Occasionally older literary variants are alluded to in the course of a tragedy as matters of interest or as contributing to the fixing of a mood. As an example of this latter way, the ax with which Clytaemestra killed Agamemnon in Stesichorus' *Oresteia* figures impressively in Cassandra's prophecy along with the sword which Aeschylus meant to be used in his play. The ax was familiar to the audience through the contemporary tradition of painting, based as it was on Stesichorus. Literary variants could be thus alluded to, followed, or disregarded, in order to produce suspense of doubtful issue, but only with great caution.

2) *Variants proceeding from conflicting local versions of the same myth.* The element of uncertainty which could be produced by these means is perhaps the most important single factor in the suspense of any Greek play. a) Often a poet would build up a strong rising action running directly counter to the main lines of the received story (*Philoctetes*, *Orestes*); but when the received story itself was honeycombed with contradictions which the audience knew, who could be certain what dramatic conclusion would be used to square all the facts? And who among

the audience was so accomplished a mythologer as to be certain the poet had no authority for the version adopted? b) Or again, a poet by starting from an isolated and little known version of a myth could develop with perfect logic a situation for which no precedent existed at all (*Helen*). c) Again, the Euripidean device of a concluding *deus ex machina* might or might not affect importantly the conclusion of a play, and thus a plot might be developed, humanly considered, on lines of absolute heresy and be mechanically squared with tradition at the end. (See Verrall's study of the *Orestes*.) Then minor variants of the myth offered endless opportunities for temporary uncertainties and surprises.

Thus we see that while to us a Greek tragedy is a region of second-hand thrills and foregone conclusions, it was anything but that to its proper audiences. Our own elementary knowledge of mythology comes indirectly from writers of the Roman period who formulated traditions fixed by the tragic poets themselves. In some cases, of course, notably the *Oresteia*, the tradition was fixed beyond recall even before Aeschylus. But this is not true of the greater part of the *Theban Cycle*, of the Heraclies stories, nor of most isolated plots like those of the *Medea* or the *Philoctetes*.

An attempt will be made in what follows to examine the evidence as to the forms of myths used by the tragic poets in their extant works, with an eye to determining as far as possible how far the use made of the received story contributed to real uncertainty on the part of the audience as to the issue of the play. Naturally the history of the stories will not concern us except in so far as they affect this question. Such historical material will naturally group itself, as we saw, into two heads: the literary predecessors which limited a playwright's opportunities, and the non-literary which enriched them.

I. STORIES OF THE TROJAN WAR.

1. Rhesus.

The only source we know for this story is *Iliad X*. The dramatist has followed this closely, introducing a few conventional dramatic devices.

a) The point of view is shifted from the Greek to the Trojan, and the two important incidents, the sending out of Dolon (149 ff.) and the arrival of Rhesus, are (264 ff.) introduced before any Greeks appear. Consequently we feel the presence of Odysseus and Diomedes as a menace hanging over the actors, which may materialize at any moment. We are kept reminded of this theme by the forebodings of Aeneas 128 *ει δ' ἐσ δόλον τιν' ηδ' ἄγει*, and of Hector 498–509. This passage is dragged in purely for this purpose, because the event Hector describes suggests the *Doloneia*. (The initial impulse of the *Doloneia* (*Il.* X, 12 ff.) was the burning of night-fires by the *Trojans*, not the Greeks. Given the shift to the Trojan point of view, the author of the *Rhesus* had to make some such change. The *φρυκτωρία* is thus poorly motivated in the play and serves merely to warn the audience of what in general is to follow, through a vague recollection of *Il.* X, 12.) The plot initiated by Odysseus is strictly an anachronism, for it comes from the *Little Iliad*. The passage may be a reminiscence of *Hec.* 239 ff.

b) Magnification of Rhesus, so that the whole war is made to depend on this night. In *Il.* X, 435 ff., he is only a lay figure who owns horses that may be stolen. In the play are introduced his strength as an ally, 276–7, 290, 309–16; his personal impressiveness 301–8, 314–6; his confidence 391–2, 447–53, 467–73, 488–91. All this is ratified by Athena's prophecy 600–5, that if Rhesus lives through the night he will win the war for the Trojans. (Cf. Soph. *Ai.* 750–7.) Also may be noted the suspense which is developed against Rhesus' entrance by the messenger's awe-struck account 284–6, which helps animate the first half of the play.

c) In the *Iliad* Rhesus had arrived the day before or at some recent time, so that the Trojan camp knew all about him though the Greeks did not; his force had not yet been coordinated with the rest of the Trojans: *Il.* X, 434 *νεήλυδες, ἔσχατοι ἀλλων*. In the play he arrives after Dolon sets out. The result is that when Odysseus and Diomedes appear (565) the keen listener realizes that they can know nothing of Rhesus, since Dolon, from whom in *Il.* X they learned about him, here knew nothing himself. In 575–6 it appears that they are still after Hector. The possibility that they may get him is a real one, for he may at any moment return to his tent and if so will be off his guard.

Thus the issue of the *Iliad* is only made possible by the intervention of Athena 595–607. This is the only example extant of a god being introduced, in the middle of a play, to square the action with tradition.

Dolon is mentioned by Diomedes in 573; we do not find out that he has been killed till 591. This bit of information, which leads us back to the tradition, follows on 567–90, during which tradition seemed to be ignored. Similarly in 499 ff. the reminder about Odysseus comes at the end of the episode of Rhesus' entrance, where again tradition was altered. 591–2 are followed by Athena's directions to Odysseus and Diomedes which put them on the right track; 499 ff. come at the end of the episode preceding Odysseus' arrival. Both of these passages are evidently pointers to the audience intimating that the familiar version is shortly to be resumed.

d) The password in 573 would hardly be introduced unless it was to be used later, and its use thus assures us that the spies will be for a time at least in the hands of the Trojans. So 682–91.

e) 161–90. Dolon's stipulating for a reward. This, like the circumstance attending Rhesus' arrival, is introduced to fill out the first half of the play, for which no example already existed. Similarly the dispute between Hector and Rhesus in 393–453, which leads to nothing, and Hector's original unwillingness in 319–341 to accept his aid.

See Porter, *Hermathena* 1913, p. 348 ff., for a theory about a literary version of the *Doloneia* between the *Iliad* and our play. Also Overbeek, *Gallerie Heroischer Bildwerke*, 412 ff.; Schreiber, *Annali* 1875, 299; Robert, *Arch. Ztg.* 1882, 47; and cf. a late Capuan vase in the Ashmolean Museum, which may have drawn on the play, where the costume is clearly *not* a disguise. The costume of Dolon on the vase at least does not establish what Porter thinks it does, and the evidence is too vague to be of use to us.

The poet of the *Rhesus* produces suspense through varying a fixed literary form:

- a) by the uncertainty of the meaning of the Greek watch-fires, 128;
- b) by the importance given to Rhesus through a theme borrowed from Soph. *Aias*;
- c) by changing the order of events so that the paths of Rhesus

and of Odysseus and Diomedes converge during the play before our eyes;

- d) by introducing suspense over the possible murder of Hector, Aeneas, or Paris;
 - e) by additional detail: password; Dolon's claim for reward; argument between Hector and Rhesus.
-

2. *Aias*.

The story of the madness and suicide of Aias following on the award of the arms was common to the *Aethiopis*, the *Little Iliad*, and the *Iliupersis*. The story seems to have been duplicated in the first two epics and alluded to in the third. (Eustath. on *Il.* XIII 515.) From the *Little Iliad* we get the essentials of the Sophoclean plot, the madness of Aias, the killing of the cattle, followed by the suicide of Aias (Proel.). The suicide is also alluded to by Pindar (*N.* vii 25 ff.; *N.* viii 23 ff.; *I.* iv 35) with a possible reference to the madness (*N.* vii 24–5, *εἰ γὰρ ἦν | ἐτὰν ἀλάθειαν ιδέμεν*) and the madness and suicide are handled by Aeschylus in the *Threissae*. (Schneidewin-Nauck, Intr. to *Ai.*, p. 45 ff.) In the last paragraph of the hypothesis to the *Aias* appear traces of a story, probably older than ours, by which Aias was killed in battle with the Trojans. To this *Od.* III 109 doubtless refers. The story about the Trojans throwing mud over him might have been a satyric perversion of this. For a death by stoning, such as the Atreidae are made to threaten in 251–2 (the chorus are reporting camp-rumor), there seems no precedent in the saga. It can hardly be an allusion to the mud-throwing story, for this was done by the Trojans in battle. We know nothing of the details of the version in the *Cycle*, and so it is impossible to say with certainty how much of Sophocles' handling is original. The speech of Aias in 646–92, nominally disclaiming the intention of suicide, really affirming it in veiled language:

654

ἀλλ᾽ εἴμι πρός τε λουτρά καὶ παρακτίους
λειμῶνας, ὡς ἂν λύμαθ' ἀγνίσας ἔμα
μῆνιν βαρεῖαν ἐξαλύξωμαι θεᾶς·
μολὼν τε χῶρον ἐνθ' ἂν ἀστιβῆ κίχω,
κρύψω τόδ' ἔγχος τούμον, ἔχθιστον βελῶν,
γαῖας ὄρύξας ἐνθα μή τις ὅψεται·
ἀλλ' αὐτὸν νῦξ "Αἰδης τε σωζόντων κάτω.

691

. . . καὶ τάχ' ἂν μ' ἵσως
πίθοισθε, κεὶ νῦν δυστυχῶ, σεσωσμένον.

is thoroughly Sophoclean and can hardly be assumed to have been paralleled in an earlier version. Nothing could be better calculated to initiate a keen suspense lasting over the following ode and episode leading to the actual suicide. On the other hand, the prophecy alluded to by the messenger:

- | | |
|-----|---|
| 752 | . . . εἰπε κάπεσκηψε, παντοίᾳ τέχνῃ
εἰρξαι κατ' ἡμαρ τούμφανες τὸ νῦν τόδε
Αἴανθ' ὑπὸ σκηναῖσι μηδ' ἀφέντ' ἔāν, . . . |
| 756 | ἔλαγ γὰρ αὐτὸν τῇδε θῆμέρα μόνη
δίας Ἀθάνας μῆνις . . . |

probably comes from the *Aethiopis* or the *Little Iliad*. We know that the time of Aias' suicide was noted in the *Aethiopis* as the early morning (Sch. Pind. *I.* iii 53); cf. Pindar *I.* iv 35 ἐν ὄψιᾳ νυκτὶ. The change to day time would be no more than was required in a daytime play. But, what is more important, 757 does not square with the rest of the Sophoclean version. Aias is no longer suffering from the wrath of Athena but from the shame consequent upon it; cf. 348–52, 367, 372–6, 460 ff., where he passes from bewilderment and savage despair to the settled conviction that life for him is no longer worth living (*vid.* 654 ff. cited above). 752–7 is clearly a survival from an older version which was not interested in real psychology, preserved here for its obvious advantage as a means of quickening suspense in an excited scene (cf. *Rhesus* 595–607).

The only reference to a previous handling of the burial theme in the *Aias* is in Eustathius ad *Il.*, p. 285, 34 Rom. δὲ τὴν μικρὰν Ἰλιάδα γράψας ιστορεῖ μηδὲ καυθῆναι συνήθως τὸν Αἴαντα, τεθῆναι δὲ οὕτως ἐν σόρω διὰ τὴν ὄργην τοῦ βασιλέως. In the *Nekyia* Aias is with the other shades and so must have been properly buried. There are references to an Aias-cult in Salamis (*I. G.* ii, 1, 594; Hdt. viii, 64, 121; Paus. i, 35, 2); in Athens he was the eponymous hero of one of the tribes (Paus. i 5, 1; iii, 9, 9; Plut., *Mor.* 628 A ff.; Plut. *Solon* 10; Hdt. v 66), and the mythical ancestor of the Eurysakidae and Philaidae (Mareell. *Vit. Thuc.* 3; Plut. *Alc.* 1; Hdt. vi 35). In fact, the Athenians took special pains to appropriate Aias as an ally through the settling in Attica of his two sons (Sch. Pind. *N.* ii 19). The only reference I can find to an actual tomb of Aias is Paus. i 35. This was in the Troad and, like the barrow of Orestes at Tegea (Hdt. i 67–8), was connected with a find of bones of fabulous size. But no hero who enjoyed

the reputation of Aias in Athens could have been thought of as cast out like Polyneices. Thus the suspense which is initiated in 1047 is purely that of a foregone conclusion. (Note also 1166-7 ἐνθα βροτοῖς τὸν ἀείμνηστον | τάφον εὐρώντα καθέξει. The anapests at the end of the scene between Teucer and Menelaus remind the audience that the cult existed and that, therefore, Aias must somehow be buried decently.) It is quite probable, however, that the raising of the burial issue is new to the saga in this play and that its novelty in part justified the use of a conclusion which seems to us tame. In the passage from Eustathius cited above, the phrase διὰ τὴν ὄργὴν τοῦ βασιλέως is tacked on at the end and may be a reason supplied by the writer who had Sophocles' play in his mind. Nowhere else do we find burial referred to as a *pis-aller* for cremation; the two customs are parallel in the period represented by the cyclic epics. And the word *συνήθως* bears the mark of a late scholar who was puzzled at finding a simple instance of burial and set about to account for it.

The myth is used for suspense:

- a) by developing through suggestive passages the familiar myth already well known, and excluding references to other stories;
- b) by over-emphasizing the function of Athena, foreign to the original story, a detail useful for momentary suspense;
- c) by developing uncertainty in the play over the burial issue, which was a foregone conclusion to the audience, not from any version of the myth, but from common knowledge of Aias' status as hero.

3. *Philoctetes*.

Three possible endings to the *Philoctetes* are indicated in the end of the episode at 1081. They are:

- a) 1078: χοῦτος τάχ' ἄν φρόνησιν ἐν τούτῳ λάβοι
λώω τιν' ἡμῖν· νῷ μὲν οὖν ὀρμώμεθον.

That is, Philoctetes may accept the situation and go to Troy;

- b) 1054: ἀφετε γάρ αὐτὸν μηδὲ προσψαύσητε ἔτι.
ἔατε μίμνειν. οὐδὲ σοῦ προσχρῆσομεν,
τά γ' ὅπλα ἔχοντες ταῦτα.

- c) 1069: ἡμῶν ὅπως μὴ τὴν τύχην διαφθερεῖς.

1072: ὅδ' ἔστιν ἡμῶν ναυκράτωρ ὁ παῖς·

1074: ἀκούσομαι μὲν ὡς ἔφυν οἴκτου πλέως
πρὸς τοῦδε.

Neoptolemus is independent of Odysseus and controls the situation. Odysseus fears that he may decide to take Philoctetes' part and ruin the p'an.

The only one of these possibilities which receives any sanction from the epic or lyric tradition is the first. Philoctetes is a hero who is to be brought from his enforced habitation at Lemnos, by whose help alone Troy can fall.¹ That no abstraction was thought of between Philoctetes and his bow is shown by the reference to Bacchylides, where the bow of Heracles first makes its appearance. . . . οἱ Ἑλλῆνες ἐκ Λήμνου μετεστείλαντο τὸν Φιλοκτήτην Ἐλένου μαντευσαμένου· εἴμαρτο γὰρ ἄνευ τῶν Ἡρακλείων τόξων μὴ πορθθῆναι τὸ Ἰλιον (*schol.* Pind. *P.* i 53. See Marx *l.c.* for the relation of Heracles' bow to the rest of the story). Philoctetes has been slighted by the Greeks, and the belated oracle simply brings him into his own: τάχα δὲ μνήσεσθαι ἔμελλον Ἀργεῖοι παρὰ νησὶ Φιλοκτήταο ἄνακτος (*Il.* II 724-5). Of recalcitrancy on his part there is naturally no question.

The tragic poets in handling this story had to make some sort of a play out of it. They could not take it *in extenso* as did the epic, and the incident which most appealed to the imagination was the encounter of Philoctetes with the messenger of the Atreidae after his exile. Obviously the dramatic value of a play dealing with this scene would depend upon the success with which the poet presented a possibility contrary to the received version. Aeschylus naturally used the simplest means to this end. Philoctetes is represented as nourishing a deep and implacable resentment against the Greeks; he broods on his sufferings, and his lamentations occupy a considerable part of the play (*Dio Chrys.* lii 4 ff.). Now that there is to be difficulty in bringing him around, the function of king's agent is shifted from Diomedes (*Ilias Parva ap. Procl.*) to Odysseus. Philoctetes fails to recognize him, and he tells a long lie about the utter disaster and desolation of the Greeks; the conclusion comes presumably after a simple process of persuasion extending over the entire play, which finally breaks down a vaguely stated conflict of will. Odysseus keeps his Homeric character of keenness and cunning without being

¹ *Il.* II 724-5; *Lit. Il. ap. Procl.*; Pindar *P.* i 50; Bacchyl. Fr. 7 Bl., 36 Jebb, 16 Bergk. See F. Marx, *Neue Jahrb. f. d. Kl. Alt.* xiii 1904, 679. Marx does not do violence to tradition in emphasizing the necessity of Philoctetes' personal presence. His account of the source of the myths is uncertain.

degraded ('Οδυσσέα δριμὺν καὶ δόλιον . . . πολὺ δὲ ἀπέχοντα τῆς νῦν κακοηθείας, Dio Chrys. lii 4). What alternative to returning with Odysseus Philoctetes may have had in mind we do not know. In order to answer this question Euripides introduced an embassy of the Trojans offering Philoctetes the throne of Troy if he would come and help them. This gave an opportunity for an *agon* between Odysseus and the Trojan agent with Philoctetes as umpire; it was this part of the play which most impressed Dio Chrysostom and doubtless formed the kernel of it. Odysseus tries to lure Philoctetes under false pretences; he is a friend, forsooth, of Palamedes who, ruined by Odysseus, is traveling back to Greece and is willing to take Philoctetes in his ship. How this is brought into connection with the offer of the Trojans—whether, that is, Philoctetes recognizes the disguised Odysseus before the Trojans appear—is uncertain. It would seem to make a better play if an *anagnorisis* came first and if in the *agon* Philoctetes was faced with the clear-cut choice of capturing or triumphantly defending Troy.¹ Sophocles made the suggestion of Philoctetes' return to Greece, which with Euripides had been merely a bait understood by the audience, into a real possibility, a great advance in the creation of suspense. To do this it was necessary to diminish the importance of Odysseus, and to this end Neoptolemus is made the pin whereon the success of the project turns, in violation of the epic source, which placed Neoptolemus' arrival at Troy after that of Philoctetes. (*Ilias Parva ap. Procl.*) Neoptolemus' youthful sympathy and comparative detachment from the interests of the Greek army make him possible in such a rôle, as neither of the traditional figures was.

The distinction which Philoctetes possessed by reason of his bow opened a third possibility, namely, that Philoctetes should be left on the island, and the bow—all that the Greeks needed—should be taken. This theme of the bow had entered the Philoctetes story independently of tragedy. In the *Catalogue*, to be sure, he is only an archer-king from Thessaly destined by his

¹ For the vases *vid.* Roscher iii² 2337 ff. The evidence is late and seems to conflict. Odysseus and Diomedes in the cave are robbing Philoctetes of his bow and arrows. Philoctetes faces the Trojans with the bow in his hand, Odysseus and Diomedes looking on from the other side. Evidence for Euripides can hardly be derived from this source.

prowess to end the war. But Philoctetes appeared independently in the Heracles-saga,¹ and when the inevitable conflation took place, his archer's prowess was made to depend on a legacy from Heracles and hence gradually became detachable from his person. Nevertheless the tradition stuck that it was Philoctetes himself and not this bow that should capture Troy, and Sophocles in spite of the obvious disadvantage cannot ignore it. Compare 196 ff. and 839–42 with 1053–62. This third possibility owes its full development to Sophocles.

In neither Aeschylus nor Euripides is Lemnos² represented as deserted, since the chorus in both cases were Lemnians. It does not matter whether or not they had attended him in the past; Philoctetes, robbed of his bow, but left with a friendly chorus on a populated island, does not constitute a tragic ending to a play. So again, in violation both of the *Iliad* (VII, 467; XXI 40) and the *Cypria* (Proel. *sub fin.*: Patroclos sold Lycaon at Lemnos), Sophocles makes Lemnos a desert island. Philoctetes is not cut off by the cliffs, for his cave opens both on sea and land (see Woodhouse, *J.H.S.* 1912, 239). In addition, Aeschylus and Euripides make the coveted bow Philoctetes' sole means of support, 287–9. The importance of the bow is kept in our minds by the business with it during the play: 55, where the stealing of the bow is the essential thing enjoined by Odysseus; 839–40, ἐγὼ δ' ὁρῶ οὕνεκα θήραν τὴνδ' ἀλίως ἔχομεν τόξων, δίχα τοῦδε πλέοντες. τοῦδε γάρ δ στέφανος, τοῦτον θεὸς εἶπε κομίζειν. Neoptolemus here repudiates the purpose of Odysseus to carry off the bow at any cost; 974, where Neoptolemus is stopped by Odysseus from returning the bow to Philoctetes; 1292, where he succeeds in doing so.

Thus in the Sophoclean play the three possibilities are fully developed: a) Philoctetes' going to Troy has the sanction of the consensus of the saga. b) The theft of the bow and the

¹ References all late; see Roscher iii² 2313; there cannot be any doubt, however, of the antiquity of the story.

² The island Chryse does not appear in the extant literature before Euripides. Corssen, *Philol.* 1907, 346, endeavors to show that it was a desert island originally associated with Philoctetes. This may be true, but we must be quite clear that it was not the Philoctetes of the Trojan saga but of the Heracles-saga, as is shown by the vase, Reinach, *Répertoire* ii 180, depicting Heracles and two boys sacrificing to a goddess Chryse. The place of banishment is Lemnos in every case. The desolation was added in literature for effect.

fresh abandonment of Philoctetes are developed out of the play itself, from the seizure of the bow, from Philoctetes' refusal, even in the face of starvation, to follow willingly, and from Odysseus' contempt for the details of the prophecy. This is made a thoroughly tragic possibility by the desolation of the island and Philoctetes' dependence on his bow. (Cf. Serv. *ad Aen.* iii 402.) c) Philoctetes' return to Greece with Neoptolemus again grows naturally out of the latter's commanding position due to the fact that he, of the two, is unknown to Philoctetes, and the sailors owe their allegiance to him. Indeed, it is the only human solution of the play.

Thus while no divergence from tradition occurs, divergent mythical themes are used to the fullest degree to create suspense:

- a) through emphasis on the Heracles myth in making Philoctetes detachable from his bow;
- b) by depopulating Lemnos in order to make the alternative more tragic;
- c) by tampering with the traditional chronology in order to bring in Neoptolemus, and using him to strengthen a further counter-possibility.

In the introduction of significant detail, the altering of chronology, and the emphasis on the personal presence of one character, the *Philoctetes* strikingly resembles the *Rhesus*.

4. *Hecabe.*

a) Polydorus and Polymestor. Polydorus in the *Iliad* (XX 407 ff.) is old enough to fight with Achilles; there he is not the son of Hecabe but of "Laothoe" (XX 46). The story of his being the child of Hecabe's old age, sent into Thrace out of the war, has no earlier parallel extant and may well be Euripides' invention. Of Polymestor there is no earlier mention at all.¹

b) Polyxena. The sacrifice of Polyxena on the grave of Achilles by Neoptolemus appeared in the *Iliupersis*, and there is

¹ Kaibel, *Hermes*, 1895, 71 ff. and R. H. Tanner, *Trans. Amer. Philol. Assoc.*, xlvi, 173 ff., point out parallels to the blinding scene in the *Cyclops*. Tanner shows from the use of certain words in the *Hecabe* which are more appropriate to the *Cyclops* that the former was written with the text of the latter in mind; therefore later. As the blinding in the *Hecabe* is a surprise, not otherwise led up to, there is no reason to suppose that the memory of the *Cyclops* led the audience to suspect it before the event.

no variant as to the general course of proceedings (*Ibycus apud schol.* Eur. *Hec.* 41; *Iliup. apud Procl. sub fin.*; vases in Roscher iii² p. 2735). There is a difficulty about the connection between the sacrifice and the resurrection of Achilles. This is not mentioned in the *Iliupersis*; but in the *Nostoi* Achilles appears (Procl.) to Agamemnon as he is sailing off and prophesies the evil things that will happen to him. Sophocles brings the sacrifice of Polyxena into the same play with the resurrection (Longin. *de Subl.* xv. 7), but a line remains from this play, obviously from the sort of speech made by Achilles in the *Nostoi*, prophesying the murder of Agamemnon in terms borrowed from Aeschylus: Fr. 483 Nauck: *χίτων σ' ἀπειρος ἐνδυτήριος κακῶν*. This speech would fit the end of a play better than the middle and would, if coupled with a request for the death of Polyxena, dwarf the interest in the sacrifice. It is not unreasonable to suppose that both in Sophocles and the *Iliupersis* the sacrifice was motivated by a prophecy from Calchas like that regarding Iphigeneia,¹ and that the connection between it and the resurrection was first made by Sophocles (so Weil, *Introduction to Eur. Hec.*); the conclusion follows that in the latter dramatist the sacrifice performed the function of the libations in the *Persians* 609 ff. and served to call up the dead.

The interest in our play is pathetic, primarily relating to Hecabe, and thus the resurrection is not, as in Sophocles, represented on the stage. The demand of Achilles is announced in the prologue 40–4, and by Odysseus 305, and the result is a foregone conclusion, as is always the case when events are predicted in the prologue by a supernatural being. In 345 ff. Polyxena offers herself a willing sacrifice. Judging from the analogy of Iphigeneia (cf. *Iph. Aul.* 1375 ff., 1552 ff. with Aesch. *Ag.* 228 ff.) we should be inclined to ascribe this to Euripides' invention, but there is nothing to prove it. (See the discussion of *Iph. Aul.* in this dissertation.) In the oldest vase representing the scene (Roscher iii², p. 2737–8) there is no question of a willing sacrifice.

The only unexpected element in the handling of received myths is Polyxena's willing sacrifice. Nevertheless, if we agree that the Polymestor story was at least unfamiliar to an Athenian

¹ Calchas appears as a spectator at the sacrifice in the *Tabula Iliaca*, Roscher iii², 2736, 65; and in Seneca *Tro.* 364, Calchas confirms a demand already made by Achilles.

audience, the whole play from 657 has all the suspense of an entirely unknown matter.

5. *Troades*.

There is no confusion which could possibly affect suspense in this play. Our knowledge of the fate of Astyanax is presupposed in 713–9, where Talthybius announces hesitatingly the sentence of the Greeks. Cf. *Iliad* XXIV 735 ff. Andromache predicts his death at the hands of the Greeks; *Ilias Parva*, fr. 18 Kinkel; *Iliup. ap. Procl.*

Similarly we know in 860 ff. that Helen will not be murdered. Menelaus' intention to punish Helen with death and his inability to do it appear in *Ilias Parva*, fr. 16 Kinkel; Ibycus *ap. schol. Ar. Lys.* 155; and *schol. Ar. Vesp.* 714; Eur. *Andr.* 628–31. In *Iliup. ap. Procl.* he takes her to the ships. In the *Odyssey* they are living happily together at Sparta. For Vases see Roscher i² 1970.

These two incidents are not mentioned in the prologue. Observe, however, that the fate of Cassandra, where variants did appear, is there settled, 41–4, 70, by reconciling the violation by Aias, son of Ileus,¹ with her servitude to Agamemnon (*Nekyia* 422; Pind. *P. xi*, 20). An obscure variant which Euripides evidently could ignore appears in *Ilias Parva*, fr. 15 Kinkel (cf. the description of a painting supposed to illustrate the *Ilias Parva* in Paus. x 27), ἀφίκετο μὲν δὴ ἐπὶ τὸν Κασσάνδρας ὁ Κόροιβος γάμον, ἀπέθανε δέ, ὡς μὲν ὁ πλειων λόγος, ὑπὸ Νεοπτολέμου, Λέσχεως δὲ ὑπὸ Διομήδους ἐποίησεν. All suspense of objective issue is thus removed in the *Troades*, so that interest can be centered on the effect upon Hecabe of one blow after another, which the audience can, but she cannot, foresee.

II. RETURN OF THE GREEKS FROM TROY.

1. *Cyclops*.

The *Cyclops* is a humorous dramatization of the ninth book of the *Odyssey* with the addition of the satyrs. The satyrs seem to have been brought into the story by Aristias the son of Pratinas,

¹ *Iliup. ap. Procl.*; Overbeck *Gal. Her.*, p. 635–55; vases, etc. in Roscher ii, i, 979 ff.; also the chest of Cypselus, Paus. v 19, 5; Polygnotus in Lesche, Paus x 26, 3.

who wrote a *Cyclops*, of which the only fragment that makes sense is *ἀπώλεσας τὸν οἶνον ἐπιχέας ὕδωρ* (cf. Eur. *Cyc.* 557–8, which means, if anything, that Silenus is trying to fill up the Cyclops' cup with water). That this connection of the Cyclops with the satyrs is more ancient than Euripides seems likely from a vase published with a reproduction by F. Winter, *Jahrb. Arch. Inst.* 1891, 271 ff., dated about 415 B.C. (cf. Robert, *Bild und Lied*, p. 35), on which Odysseus' companions are preparing to put out the eye of the sleeping Cyclops whilst satyrs frisk about. The same story, with or without the satyrs, was handled by Cratinus in a comedy, probably soon after this play.¹

Nevertheless, Euripides follows Homer fairly closely. The main variations are these (see W. Schmid, *Philol.* 1896, 59–60):

a) 445–6, 507 ff, 536 ff. The Cyclops sets out to join his companions; this is merely a false lead to quicken suspense for the time.

b) The blinding of the Cyclops is not necessary as in Homer, because from the necessities of the stage the cave-mouth cannot be closed. Therefore the motive becomes purely one of revenge (422, 441, 693), and the act a tragic retribution for *hybris* (605). The Cyclops' famous speech of calculated blasphemy, 316–46, thus becomes a necessary element in the mock-tragic effect. The slaughter of the companions (397 ff.) has to be kept, for the same reason. In Cratinus' comedy no one was killed (shown by Kaibel, *Herm.* 1895, 71 ff.), but nothing needed to be motivated in comedy.

c) 131–203. (See F. Hahne, *Philol.* 1907, 36 ff.) Odysseus has no intention of meeting the Cyclops and only does so through dawdling with Silenus. This is a necessary consequence of his finding someone on the island who can tell him of the Cyclops from a Greek point of view, but it none the less contributes to suspense.

d) 437–40, 466–8, 619–23, 708–9. The freeing of the satyrs. This motive appears also in the *Ichneutae*, possibly also in the *Busiris* (Kaibel, *l.c.*), and might apparently be an element of any satyr-plot. Suspense again appears only as the result of added details: the Cyclops going to join his companions; Odysseus' desire to escape the Cyclops, where the added suspense is short.

¹ R. H. Tanner, *Trans. Amer. Philol. Assoc.* xlvi 173 ff.

2. *Agamemnon.*

The story of the murder of Agamemnon passes through three stages, of which our play is the third.

a) *Odyssey* III 198, 235, 250, 303–5; IV 91–2, 519–37; XI 409–10; XXIV 22, 97. This is a primitive version, in which Aegisthus seduces Agamemnon's wife during his absence and murders him over a banquet at his return. In IV 536–7 there is a free fight between the followers of the respective rivals, in which everyone is killed. Clytaemestra's part in the murder is secondary.

b) The beginnings of another story appear in *Od.* XI 410–29 ἔκτα σὺν οὐλομένῃ ἀλόχῳ, XXIV 97 Αἴγισθου ὑπὸ χερούς καὶ οὐλομένης ἀλόχοιο. Here the deaths of Agamemnon and Cassandra at the hands of Clytaemestra and Aegisthus are told in inextricable confusion. Clytaemestra is certainly thought of as having planned the business (429); what she did, beyond butchering Cassandra over her already prostrate husband, is doubtful. XXIV 97 is a mere doublet of the passage in XI. We get nearer the familiar version in III 309–10 which ἐν τισι τῶν ἐκδόσεων οὐκ ἦσαν (*schol.*);

ἢ τοι δὲ τὸν κτείνας δάινυ τάφον Ἀργείοισι
μητρός τε στυγέρης καὶ ἀνάλκιδος Αἴγισθοιο,

referring of course to Orestes. This is the earliest notice of the mother-murder and implies that she had a more active part in the death of Agamemnon than that of a contriver. Lines of this type in Homer (see *schol.* to *Od.* I 300 οὐκ οἶδεν δὲ ποιητῆς τὸν Κλυταιμήστρας ὑπὸ τοῦ παιδὸς μόρον) are generally insertions from later epics (cf. *schol.* to *Iliad* XXIV 720; *Iliad* XXIII 843; *Od.* VIII 192 etc.) Hesiod referred to Clytaemestra's unfaithfulness (*Kat. Gyn.* fr. 67 Evelyn-White), and the *Nostoi* told of the murder of Agamemnon by Aegisthus and Clytaemestra (*Procl. sub fin.*). These literary references are, however, too scanty for us to draw conclusions from as to the form of the story in the later epic; we can only say that the part of Clytaemestra grew in importance, and that her punishment was thought necessary.

But the vases of the fifth century show a fairly consistent tradition evidently fixed by literary authority (Robert, *Bild und Lied*, Ch. V), and the vase in this series (Robert *l.c.* No. 7) that deals with the death of Agamemnon shows Clytaemestra approaching an open door brandishing an ax. The one outstanding literary

version known to us between Homer and Aeschylus was the *Oresteia* of Stesichorus, and this we know from the quoting of the opening lines in Ar. *Pax* 775 to have been current and familiar in the fifth century. (Lines 1–2 of Stes. *Or.* are quoted as one might quote: “Of man’s first disobedience and the fruit . . .” or “Μῆνιν ἄειδε θεά.” See *schol. ad loc.*) There is no evidence that Cassandra figured here. The outlines of this version seem harsh and savage. Clytaemestra steps into Aegisthus’ place of the *Odyssey*, and the ax typifies the unnatural brutality of her deed; she kills Agamemnon merely to get him out of the way. This had also been treated by a lyric poet Xanthus, used extensively by Stesichorus and mentioned by Athenaeus, xii, 513A πολλὰ δὲ τῶν Ξάνθου παραπεποίηκεν ὁ Στησίχορος ὥσπερ καὶ τὴν Ὀρεστέαν καλούμενην.

c) The foreshadowing of the third and characteristically fifth-century version appears in Pindar *P.* xi 22 ff.

πότερόν νυν ἄρ’ Ἰφιγένει’ ἐπ’ Εὐρίπῳ
σφαχθεῖσα τῇλε πάτρας ἔκνισεν βαρυπάλαμον ὅρσαι χόλον;
ἢ ἑτέρῳ λέχει δαμαζομέναν
ἔννυχοι πάραγον κοῖται;

With this begins the civilizing of the story by the study of motive. Pindar merely mentions Cassandra (*P.* xi 33) as killed with Agamemnon, while Aeschylus uses the Iphigeneia-theme 218–57, 1415, 1525–9, 1555–9; general dissatisfaction of the neglected wife, 606–10; Aegisthus 1435–7; Chryseis 1439; Cassandra 1440–7, 1263, as all vital in developing Clytaemestra’s motive.

The story is thus made tragic because, with all its horror, it exhibits a sequence of cause and effect, logical indeed, if not inevitable, with its root in Agamemnon’s history as well as in his wife’s. (See Hedwig Jordan’s article on the development of ‘Das Tragische’ in Aeschylus. *Neue Jahrb. f. d. Kl. Alt.* 1908, 322.)

Other elements derived by Aeschylus from the story are:

a) Cassandra. There is no good reason to suppose that she did not appear in Stesichorus, though we have no definite evidence. Certainly the passage in Pindar proves that she was part of the continuous tradition, and it is useless to talk about her being taken from the *Odyssey* (*Bild und Lied*, p. 180).

b) The watchman is taken out of the *Odyssey* (*Bild und Lied*,

p. 180 n.) where, however, he was merely a picket of Aegisthus to watch for Agamemnon's return (III 524-8). The chain of beacon fires was suggested to Aeschylus by an incident of the Persian war. Xerxes established a chain of such beacons through the islands to announce the capture of Athens (Hdt. ix 3). Fischl, *Fernspreche u. Meldewesen in Altertum*, Prog. Schweinfurt, 1904, who collects the evidence for ancient telegraphy, fails to find any other early parallel. The advantage to suspense in announcing the approach of Agamemnon by these bizarre means is obvious; it is explained to us 8-10. The light is seen, 20. The chorus doubts Clytaemestra's word, 317-9; appears convinced, 351-4, but returns to its doubt, 475-87; the evidence is not sufficient for it.

c) (From Robert, *Bild und Lied*, p. 164.) The herald, 503 ff., is a degraded Talthybius, like the Paedagogus in Soph. *Electra*. Talthybius saved Orestes from Clytaemestra at the murder of Aegisthus in Stesichorus (vases in Robert, Ch. V), and was later the companion of Orestes' return (Melian relief, identified by his herald's cap, *Mittheil. d. Inst.* vi, Taf. lvii; Roscher, i, 1237-8). Hence it seems to follow that he had early been represented as present at the murder of Agamemnon and rescuing the young Orestes, as he is said to do in Nic. Dam. *ap. schol.* Müller F.H.G. iii fr. 34, p. 374.

d) The brutality of the Stesichorean story is softened by Clytaemestra's use of a sword—that of Aegisthus—instead of an ax. The strength of the tradition which associated an ax with Clytaemestra both here and at the death of Aegisthus (vases Robert *l.c.*, Eur. *Tro.* 361) appears from Aeschylus' allusions to it. There has been such confusion on this simple point (Robert *B. u. L.*, p. 176; Wilamowitz, *Aesch. Interp.*, p. 173 n.; Höfer *ap.* Roscher ii¹ 1237) that it may be well to quote the relevant passages in full. They are:

Sword: Ag. 1262	ἐπεύχεται θήγουσα φωτὶ φάσγανον ἐμῆς ἀγωγῆς ἀντιτίσασθαι φόνον.
1528-9	μηδὲν ἐν "Αιδον μεγαλαυχεῖτω ξιφοδηλήτω θανάτῳ τίσας ἄπερ ἥρξεν.
Cho. 1011	. . . φᾶρος τόδ', ως ἔβαψεν Αἰγίσθου ξίφος.
Ax: Ag. 1127	μελαγκέρω λαβοῦσα μηχανήματι.
Cho. 889	δοίη τις ἀνδροκμῆτα πέλεκυν ως τάχος.

Besides these specific references to the sword, the language elsewhere used of the murder can only be taken in one way:

Ag. 1343 . . . καιρίαν πλήγην ἔχω.

Surely a remark verging on the obvious, from a man with his skull broken in!

Ag. 1405 . . . νεκρὸς δέ, τῆσδε δεξιᾶς χερὸς
ἔργον, δυκαῖας τέκτονος.

The only definite evidence for the ax in the *Agamemnon* is Wilamowitz's emendation of 1116 (*Aesch. Int., l.c.*). 1262-3 is implicitly ruled out of court, if I understand his argument, because Cassandra only begins to visualize the murder in 1114 ff. If so, why is she certain of the ax in 1116, but in 1127 can do no better than "black-horned engine"? As to the emendation, surely the ἀλλὰ expresses only a loose transition between ideas. In 1115 she sees the net, and the 'net' suggests one aspect of the situation as a whole. "Net! Nay, his own bedfellow is a snare!" As to ἄρκυς in this loose sense, cf. Barnes on Eur. *Electra* 965, 'sunt autem haec proverbialia, in laqueos, casses, retia, incidere, eis ἄρκυς πίπτει ubi quis in periculum aut malum aliquod improviso cadit', and see indices to Aeschylus and Euripides for examples.

Nevertheless, μελαγκέρω μηχανήματι is a reference to the Stesichorean ax. Taken with 1262-3 it stimulates a certain curiosity as to how the murder will be consummated. 1343 and 1405 make it fairly clear to the audience that a sword was used and this is settled definitely by 1528-9.

d) The complete obscuring of Aegisthus is peculiarly Aeschylean. It follows naturally from his conception of the story. The play is a study of Clytaemestra's feeling toward Agamemnon and to this end the two are the only important figures to appear before the murder. During this part of the play we study Clytaemestra's hatred toward her husband, expressed in intense irony, legitimately interpreting it by subsequent events; the short references she makes afterwards to the causes of the hatred serve to fill in the impression we have already gathered. To have brought in Aegisthus earlier would have blurred this impression by making us dwell on the least worthy of all her motives, which Aeschylus, like Pindar (*l.c.*), wishes to suppress. Nevertheless,

he has to come in at the end in order to make him a real figure for us, since in the next play he has to be killed.

Stesichorus' *Oresteia* had fixed the Agamemnon story too securely for any suspense to be developed by Aeschylus as to main issues. Mythological suspense appears only in details: a) Will she use an ax or sword? and has she used an ax or sword? b) Will Aegisthus have anything to do with the murder? c) Delay over the uncertain announcement of victory by the fire telegraph.

The main suspense lies in the unfolding, not of Clytaemestra's purpose, but of her motive.

3. *Choephoroe*. Sophocles' *Electra*. Euripides' *Electra*.

The retribution story has two stages only:

a) *Od.* III 307–8.

. . . κατὰ δ' ἔκτανε πατροφονῆα
Αἴγισθον δολόμητιν, ὃ οἱ πατέρα κλυτὸν ἔκτα.

So *Od.* I 30, 298; III 198. In XI 457 ff. Agamemnon asks about his son, concluding significantly:

461 οὐ γάρ πω τέθνηκεν ἐπὶ χθονὶ δῖος Ὁρέστης.¹

b) *Od.* III 309–10. The death of Clytaemestra and Aegisthus together is alluded to in the two late lines. This can only mean that Clytaemestra had been killed by her son. The vengeance of Orestes and Pylades is mentioned in the *Nostoi* (Proel.); it is not said on whom it falls, but as Aegisthus and Clytaemestra are both named as guilty, it is reasonable to suppose, on both. So Pindar *P.* xi 37. In the *Oresteia* of Stesichorus, Orestes first kills Aegisthus; Clytaemestra rushes up with the ax but is held and disarmed by Talthybius (vases in *Bild und Lied*, Ch. V). There is nothing to show whether or not he despatched her afterwards.

The version of the *Choephoroe* does not differ materially from this. Aegisthus is first killed (869). Clytaemestra appears, attracted by the noise (885) and after a dispute with Orestes,

¹ This strictly Homeric version seems to be the source of the relief from Aricia in *Arch. Zeit.* 1849, taf. II; Baumeister, *Denk.*, p. 1112. Clytaemestra seeks to hinder Orestes, who is killing Aegisthus. There are no names on the relief, but this identification of the scene (Welcker's) is probable. It is a good, archaic Greek work. See O. Jahn in the original publication.

serving to emphasize the justice of his design and Apollo's will, is driven inside and killed (930). The scene represented on the vases was impossible for Aeschylus, since killing was not allowed on the stage. The settlement with Aegisthus needed no apology, but the interval which is inserted between that and 930 gives a chance to summarize at the supreme moment the leading ideas of the tragedy, well epitomized in 923:

σύ τοι σεαυτήν, οὐκ ἔγώ, κατακτενεῖς.

Notable is the reference to an ax in 889. To the audience, for whom the tradition of her rushing at him with an ax still lived, this brings a keen thrill of excitement.

In Euripides' *Electra* the separation of the two victims is made still greater. This springs naturally from Euripides' new conception of the story.¹ Electra is removed to a peasant's cottage in order that the hatred springing from her humiliation may be the determining motive of the mother-murder. (Cf. Sheppard in *Class. Rev.* 1918, 137 ff. for good psychological analysis.) Aegisthus is not important enough to be brought to this retreat, and so he is killed at a festival to the nymphs (625); his death is the subject of the only proper angelia in this series of plays, 774-858, which intervenes after the old man had been despatched to lure Clytaemestra to her death (684). After Electra's speech over Aegisthus' head, there follows the stichomythia, 962-87, corresponding to *Cho.* 908-30, explaining the necessity for the coming deed. Orestes' wavering is thus spread over a period (cf. Sheppard, *l.c.*); it was only momentary in *Cho.* (899). Clytaemestra is ignorant of what is in store for her, while we see her on the stage, and for the suspense of hearing her plead for her life is substituted that of her ignorance as against the irony of her destroyers in 1007, 1111, 1118, etc. Euripides makes the play, in short, one of intrigue. In the *Choephoroe*, Orestes and Pylades seize the palace once for all by a *coup de main*, namely, the death of Aegisthus. In Euripides, the chances of miscarriage continue up to the end. Aegisthus is taken, not alone before his house, but at a public festival surrounded by a body guard 798-9, 631-3, on whose favor, after the death of their master, all further success depends (632); Orestes' mastery of this body guard, not

¹ See Wilamowitz's convincing account of this play in *Die beiden Electren, Herm.* 1883, 214.

the murder itself, is the real climax of the angelia (844–55); even here the forethought of the plotters penetrates, for it is the old man himself (853, cf. 664–6) who starts the acclamation of Agamemnon's heir. Again it is the old man's business (664–6) to correlate this murder with Clytaemestra's journey to us and to see that news is kept from her. The scene before the hut, 998 ff., is in its effects a doublet of *Hecabe* 953 ff. Physical force is in each case kept concealed up to the crucial moment.

In literary form, the version of Sophocles returns to that of the *Choephoroe*. Clytaemestra and Aegisthus are killed in the palace within a few minutes of each other, the preparatory dialogue in each case taking place before us. The lesser importance of Aegisthus is indicated, not by making his death preliminary to the other, but by relegating it to the exodus. This enables the poet to keep his actors in the excitement of action to the very end; failing this, he would have had to end with moral reflexions, and this is what he evidently wished to avoid. The sense of danger and uncertainty which Aeschylus neglects to create, is made to pervade the play, in Orestes' stealthy withdrawal (75), in the emphasis on the false story told at length, in the paedagogus mounting guard inside, 1326 ff., and in the remark *οὐτις ἄνδρων ἐνδον* 1369. Much of this may have been in Stesichorus and been brushed aside by Aeschylus in his concentration on the moral issue, but our evidence for the similarity of the two versions is only that Talthybius was Orestes' companion in the art type.

Other incidents of the dramatic handling are:

a) Anagnorisis. The anagnorisis in Stesichorus between Electra and the returning Orestes was, if we are to judge from the Melian relief, a simple affair.¹ Talthybius accosts Electra; Orestes remains in the background at first. Talthybius is known to Electra and to the old nurse who accompanies her (Laodameia in Stesichorus; *schol. ad Cho.* 733; Arsinoe in Pindar *P. xi* 17), and introduces himself and Orestes.

b) Dream. The dream of Clytaemestra was taken over from Stesichorus, of whom the fragment remains (42 Bergk.)

τῷ δὲ δράκων ἐδόκησε κάρα βεβρωμένος ἄκρον·
ἐκ δ' ἄρα τοῦ βασιλεὺς Πλεισθενίδας ἐφάνη.

¹ Discussion in Robert, *Bild und Lied*, Ch. V. Picture in Roscher s.v. Electra.

The interpretation of these lines is uncertain. (Compare Robert *Bild und Lied*, p. 170–1; Wilam. *Aesch. Interp.*, p. 191, for the two interpretations.) A dream implies, however, most of the earlier action, viz. the libations and anagnorisis at the tomb.

c) The price on Orestes' head. Eur. *El.* 33. The source is uncertain.

d) Pylades as Orestes' companion in revenge dates from the *Nostoi* (Proel.), where the story must have been expanded to some degree. He does not appear in the fifth century art type and hence probably not in Stesichorus, where, to judge from the Melian relief, his part of assistant was played by Talthybius, as by the paedagogus in Soph. *El.* (Cf. the passage from Nie. Dam. quoted by Robert, p. 164, in which Pylades and Talthybius both appear.) He is important for suspense only through his three lines in *Choephoroe* 902 ff., which give the effect of a divine oracle fortifying Orestes' resolution.

e) Chrysothemis is borrowed from the list of Agamemnon's daughters in *Il.* IX 145, 287. Sophocles does not dare violate verisimilitude by placing Agamemnon's tomb on the stage, and yet he wishes to use the dream and libations of Clytaemestra and the offerings of Orestes. Electra must be kept on the stage throughout, and Chrysothemis is requisitioned to carry the libations. She is useful as a foil to Electra and in character is merely a doublet of Ismene, as was noted by Wilamowitz in *Die beiden Electren*. That she had some part in the saga between Homer and Sophocles is shown by the type-vase (Robert, p. 149a, p. 155), where she is present at the death of Aegisthus.

f) 379–84, the purpose of Clytaemestra and Aegisthus to immure Electra is borrowed from the *Antigone* (*vid.* Wilamowitz, *l.c.*) 773–80, 885–90.

In both the *Agamemnon* and the plays dealing with Orestes' revenge, the issue was fixed by tradition. Suspense could be created either by sheer illusion or by rousing curiosity as to the means whereby the foregone conclusion would be reached.

Details worthy of note are:

a) suspense in *Choephoroe* as to whether Clytaemestra will resist by force, 889;

b) variation in the three plays in means of creating suspense over the killing of Aegisthus;

c) echo of the *Hecabe* in Eur. *El.* 998 ff.

4. *Orestes.*

In 52–3 the fact that Menelaus is coming is noted by Electra in the prologue. This expectation governs suspense till 356, when he actually appears, and so all through the earlier part of the play (243–4, 448, 634–5, 722) it is assumed that Menelaus can save Orestes if he wishes. After the public trial it becomes merely a question of punishing Menelaus (1099, 1105, 1143, 1171). Later Electra returns to the first idea; if Menelaus cannot be persuaded, he may be forced to save Orestes and herself, 1339 Μενέλαον ἡμᾶς μὴ θανόντας εἰσιδεῖν. No doubt is cast on his ability to do this. In the final crazy scene Orestes returns to this idea (1610–1). All this is suggested by *Od.* III 311–2, where Menelaus appears the day when Clytaemestra is killed. In *Orestes* the murder happened five days sooner (422). Euripides' play, so far as suspense goes, is built up around this suggestion that Menelaus may save the murderers from the human consequences of their deed. The counter-action is provided by a public trial, an entire innovation. The conventional later history of Orestes, viz. the Dorian (1643–52), appears mechanically at the end. Here the play is built around a mere suggestion in Homer. Obviously in a situation created entirely by Euripides, no matter what we may have read or heard about Orestes, the suspense is as vivid as in a play dealing with new characters.

5. *Eumenides.*

Aeschylus said in the *Choephoroe* (1034 ff.) only that Orestes would go to Delphi to seek atonement and release from the Furies. The *Eumenides* opens before the Delphian temple. In Apollo's first speech it appears that the atonement cannot be consummated here (79 ff.), but that Orestes must go to Athens and put himself under the protection of Athena. The only question for us is whether or not Aeschylus had any precedent for the story of Orestes' acquittal by the Areopagus and Athena. It has been assumed by two groups of scholars (see Wilamowitz., *Aesch. Int.*, p. 189; Hirzel, *Rh. Mus.* xliii 631–5; Zielinski, *Neue Jahrb. f. d. Kl. Alt.*, II 1899, p. 169; Höfer ap. Roscher, s.v. *Orestes*) that there was an old Athenian tradition that in some way or other Orestes was acquitted in Athens. The first of these advance a theory that the story represented an Athenian reaction against the religious authority of Delphi; it is not the god that can ac-

quit of murder, but the state. The second base their statement on the argument that the Eupatrid *family* (distinct from the social class) traced its descent and its name from someone who was pious toward his father—who could be none other than Orestes. Therefore Orestes must have settled in Athens, and the story was a family legend. Beyond this, there is no evidence that I can discover. In Eur. *Or.* 939 ff. the story of Orestes' visit to Athens and the founding of the festival of the Choes had no bearing on Orestes' fate or later fortunes, as is seen by the way Euripides uses it in connection with another story. The art representations (see Roscher iii¹ 989 ff.) are too late to proceed from a pre-dramatic source. For our purposes, then, we must assume that the Athenian story of Orestes' acquittal was invented whole and entire by Aeschylus. It contradicts: a) the Athenian story of the founding of the Areopagus which Aeschylus tried to explain away in 685 ff., but which Euripides reasserts in *Electra* 1258 ff., where he endeavors to make peace between the Aeschylean and the traditional versions; b) the previous literary tradition as established by the type vase (Roscher iii¹, 979 ff.), in which Orestes was purified finally by Apollo at Delphi by pig's blood (cf. *Eum.* 282). There is no reason to suppose (Robert *Bild und Lied*, p. 181) that this was not the version followed by Stesichorus. It was obviously a Delphian story and Stesichorus composed in the hey-day of Delphian influence. For its influence on his *Oresteia* we have in *schol. Eur. Or.* 258 (= Fr. 40 Bergk³) the bow given by Apollo to Orestes. This seems to imply the Furies and is thus the first reference to them in this story. The provincial story of the *Oresteion* in Parrhasia was dug up by the logographers (the earliest source is Pherecydes *ap. schol. Eur. Or.* 1645) and inserted by Euripides into a speech by the god, like other obscure local cults. Cf. *Helen* 1673-4, *Phoen.* 1707, *Hip.* 1424, etc.

In the *Eumenides*, then, after lines 79-80 Aeschylus is tapping a new source. The audience, expecting the reconciliation to take place at Delphi will be surprised at Apollo's words, 64 ff.

οὐ τοι προδώσω· διὰ τέλους δέ σοι φύλαξ . . .

66 ἐχθροῖσι τοῖς σοῖς οὐ γενήσομαι πέπων.

These are not the words of confidence but of determination in the face of difficulties. This is partially explained 79-80. The

essential thing is that Orestes should put himself under the protection of the bretas of Athena; from then on we shall find some way. No solution is indicated in 235–396, during the persecution by the Furies; in 290 Orestes heightens our interest by proclaiming an alliance with Argos if Athena saves him. In 397 Athena appears and without any declaration of purpose holds a preliminary hearing that ends with a profession of non-competence (470 ff.) parallel to Apollo's in 64 ff. In 480–9 she outlines the form proceedings will take, without any mention of the Areopagus or even of the number of jurors to be chosen—487 *κρίνασα δ' ἀστῶν τῶν ἐμῶν τὰ βέλτιστα / ἥξω.* In 566 she suddenly reappears with the jurors and proceedings begin at once. The case is heard out; while the jurors are depositing their votes (676 ff.), Athena explains who they are—that is, our familiar Areopagus; to forestall objection the name is explained without recourse to the Halirrhothios story. But it is quickly seen (710 ff.) that a sinister cloud hangs over the establishment of this institution. Either the dread divinities or the God of Light himself must be slighted and alienated by the decision our Areopagus is to make—the first in its history. We turn to await the decision with suspense deepened by the intermingling of patriotism and pious wonder. In this awful issue, Hades and Athens and Olympus seem inextricably confused; and our wonder is enhanced by the compelling force of novelty.

Once the decision is rendered, suspense turns on the appeasing of the Erinyes. There is not a man in the audience who will not sleep easier on his bed to-night if some means are found.

The play is thus a fine *tour de force.* For a long time it seems to drag along inconclusively; but the hearing itself is quickly over, and the suspense of the announcement is intensified by the bit of aetiology (681–710) which suddenly illuminates the issue by aligning it with the politics and institutions of contemporary Athens. Thus the nature of the court is itself made an element of suspense that runs parallel and joins forces with the suspense about Orestes' fate.

Mythological suspense proper lasts only to line 80. The opening of the play at Delphi constitutes a strong false lead that the play will be concluded here according to the legend. The rest is new and uncertain. In the face of a new situation the suspense rests on; a) the novel means of acquittal, b) the bearing

on Athens of the proceedings. Except for the drama, Orestes rather drops out of sight in the legend after the death of his mother and even a condemnation is not inconceivable.

6. *Iphigeneia in Aulis.*

There is no variation in the main lines of our play from the story of the Cypria (Procl.). Κάλχαντος δὲ εἰπόντος τὴν τῆς θεοῦ μῆνιν καὶ Ἰφιγένειαν κελεύσαντος θύειν τῇ Ἀρτέμιδι, ὡς ἐπὶ γάμου αὐτὴν Ἀχιλλεῖ μεταπεμψάμενοι θύειν ἐπιχειροῦσιν· "Ἄρτεμις δὲ αὐτὴν ἔξαρπάσσασα εἰς Ταύρους μετακομίζει καὶ ἀθάνατον ποιεῖ, ἔλαφον δὲ ἀντὶ τῆς κόρης παρίστησι τῷ βώμῳ. The transference to the Tauri was mentioned in the lost conclusion to our play (Aelian, *H.A.* vii 39).

Variations which give the peculiar character to this play must be noted. The question of motivation, (cf. *Iph. Taur.* 20-4 with Aesch. *Ag.* 192-215), though significant for the myth, does not concern us (cf. Wilamowitz *Herm.* 1883, 249 ff.). We observe: a) the willing self-sacrifice of Iphigeneia; b) Achilles as Iphigeneia's chivalrous protector and later, lover; c) Menelaus as the promoter of the sacrifice. The second of these requires the first, for so only can Achilles be made to rise in her defense and then withdraw without appearing a poltroon.

a) The self-sacrifice.¹ This was a stock theme with Euripides: Macaria in *Heracleidae*, 474 ff.; Polyxena in *Hec.* 345 ff. (cf. with this the vases, which represent a forced sacrifice); Euadne, Eur. *Suppl.* 990 ff.; Menoeceus, *Phoen.* 991 ff. (cf. Eur. *Erechtheus* (Nauck); cf. *Phrixus* fr. 829, fr. 833, and Hyg. *Fab.* 2; cf. also *Iph. Taur.* 669-716). There seems to have been no parallel to this in older versions: cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 228-38 where she is bundled up in clothes, gagged, and butchered. Even the language of *Iph. Taur.* 27 μεταρσία ληφθεῖσ' ἐκαυδόμην ξίφει points to a forced sacrifice.

The idea of a willing sacrifice existed already in cult myths, and the one which lay readiest to Euripides' hand was that of Aglauros, the daughter of Cecrops, who freely offered herself as a sacrifice during a long war (Philochorus *ap. schol.* Dem. xix 303; *schol.* Arist. *Panath.* 119). In Paus. i, 18, 2, she and her sister Herse dash themselves to death from the Acropolis after disobey-

¹ Since the above was written, this whole subject has been made a special study by Johanna Schmitt, *Freiwilliger Opfertod bei Euripides*, Giessen 1921.

ing Athena in opening the receptacle containing the infant Erichthonius. The ritual in her honor was the Plynteria. See Phot. *Lex.* p. 127; Hesych. *s.v.* Πλυντήρια: Bekk. *Anecd.* i 270, line 2. The origin of Aglauros is mysterious, but a sinister side of her character appears in Porphyry, *De Abst.* ii 54; in Cyprus she used to receive human sacrifices until these were taken over by Diomedes. This means only that a divinity of this character, called Aglauros, was in Cyprus. The “ἡ Κέκροπος” is a note by the person who observed the usage, or by a mythographer. In Athens she is associated with the Cecropian snake (Apollod., iii 14, 6, 5; Paus. i 18, 2) she is in fact much the same sort of goddess that Iphigeneia originally was (Harrison in *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 1891, 350–5), and the parallels between the two are striking. Each was sacrificed in Greece for success in war; each was connected with human sacrifice in a distant place. With the Plynteria, during which the bretas of Athena was carried to the sea and washed, compare the story of the bretas-washing in *Iph. Taur.* Euripides handled this story in the *Erechtheus*, where one of Erechtheus' daughters was sacrificed to secure victory against Eumolpus. Her two sisters committed suicide (*Paradox.* ed. Westermann 219), and the three became afterwards Hyades (*schol.* to Aratus 172). The Hyades are clearly the two dew-goddesses Herse and Pandrosos plus Aglauros. Euripides hardly called them by these names, or they would have appeared in the mythographers as daughters of Erechtheus, but the suicide of Herse and Pandrosos, after Aglauros' death, is mentioned in *schol.* Arist. *Panath.* 119. As to the names of Erechtheus' daughters, there is no agreement among the mythographers. There is no evidence in the fragments as to a willing, or unwilling, sacrifice. Emphasis is laid on the willingness of the mother, Praxithea, to give up her daughter. Euripides' general custom, plus the references to Aglauros quoted above, are enough to make it probable that the maiden did not die unwillingly. See Eur. *Fragments* 357, 360. It is of course possible that the girl was only a child and had no speaking part.

A similar story, not used by Euripides so far as we know, comes from Antoninus Liberalis 25 = Bergk *Korinna* fr. 7, cf. Ov. *Met.* 13, 681, ff. *ἱστορεῖ Νίκανδρος ἐτεροιουμένων δ' καὶ Κόριννα ἐτεροιων ἀ· Ὄριων τοῦ Τριέως ἐν Βοιωτίᾳ ἐγένοντο θυγατέρες Μητιόχη καὶ Μενιππη.*

A pestilence fell on the country and word was brought from Gortynian Apollo ἀλάσασθαι δύο τοὺς Ἐριονίους θεούς· ἔφη δὲ καταπάνσειν αὐτοὺς τὴν μῆνιν εἰ δύο δυσὶν ἐκοῦσαι πάρθενοι θύματα γένοιντο. These two girls volunteered and committed suicide, καὶ αὗται μὲν ἀμφότεραι κατέπεσον ἐς τὴν γῆν. Φερσεφόνη δὲ καὶ Ἀιδης οἰκτέραντες τὰ μὲν σώματα τῶν παρθένων ἡφάνισαν· ἀντὶ δ' ἐκείνων ἀστέρας ἀνήνεγκαν ἐκ τῆς γῆς. (Cf. the Hyades in *schol.* Arat. 172 *supr.*, which evidently is drawn from a speech by a god at the end of Euripides' play.) οἱ δὲ φανέντες ἀνηνέχθησαν εἰς οὔρανον καὶ αὐτοὺς ὠνόμασαν ἄνθρωποι κομῆτας· ἴδρυσαντο δὲ πάντες "Ἄονες ἐν Ὀρχομένῳ τῆς Βοιωτίας ἵερὸν ἐπίσημον τῶν παρθένων τούτων· καὶ αὐτᾶς καθ' ἕκαστον ἔτος κόροι τε καὶ κόραι μειλίγματα φέρουσιν· προσαγορεύονται δ' αὐτὰς ἄχρι νῦν Αἰολεῖς Κορωνίδας παρθένους.

Korone and Koronis are names belonging to the cult of Asclepius.¹ Koronis, the mother of Asclepius, was a goddess in her own right in Pergamon (*Num. Chron.* 1882, p. 36, pl. I, 13) and at Titane in Sikyonia (*Paus.* ii, 11, 7). These Koronides are identical with the Ἐριονίοι θεοί to whom they are sacrificed, and these are local earth-gods who must be appeased. The analogy between the cults from which sacrifice-stories proceed is thus striking. The same cult-names appear occasionally in more than one of them; *e.g. schol.* *Pind. P.* iii 14; *schol.* *Il.* IV 195; *Hyg. Fab.* 97. Arsinoe is interchangeable with Koronis as mother or wife of Asclepius. In *Pind. P.* xi 17 Arsinoe is the nurse of Orestes. In the passage quoted from Porphyry Koronis is the ancient name of Salamis, where Aglauros was worshiped with human sacrifice. Further discussion of these matters would take us too far afield. It is enough to point out the connection of these early stories of a willing sacrifice with a chthonian worship analogous to the cult of Iphigeneia. Cf. the parallel Orchomenian story of Androklea and Alkis, *Paus.* ix 17, 1. Thus the theme of a willing sacrifice was secured by Euripides from his studies of myths of various localities, not from literature. Where a willing sacrifice occurs in any play, the supposition is from the beginning that the sacrifice will be consummated, always with the possibility of divine intervention.

b) Achilles' chivalrous conduct, though it was echoed and developed in later literature, seems to have had no earlier parallel. Achilles offers his services to help Iphigeneia (950), and the sus-

¹ Full discussion in *Roscher* ii, 1, 1385 ff.

pense of the next section of the play depends on what he may be able to do. This is curiously crossed in 1368–1405. Iphigeneia offers herself; which act at once takes the responsibility for her off Achilles' shoulders and makes him really anxious to save her and get her for himself. Cf. 959–60 with 1404–5. A compromise in the action is reached in 1424–9. He will ground arms near the altar, ready to carry off his Guenevere through the fire and the rest of the army if *she* but gives the word.

Achilles had not, except for the use of his name, appeared in the story before. His appearance, and his vigorous taking of sides, obscure the compulsion of the saga and give the impression of a new story.

c) Soph. *Iph.* fr. 284 (see context in Phot. *Lex.* p. 410, 13) and *Iph. Taur.* 24–5 make Odysseus the king's agent as in the *Philoctetes*. The fragment represents Odysseus talking to Clytaemestra. Either, then, Clytaemestra came to Aulis as in *Iph. Aul.* or the scene was Argos, where extraordinary means must have been used to make a play out of it. In *Iph. Taur.* 24–5 Clytaemestra clearly does not go to Aulis. Little is to be got from the other fragments of Soph. *Iph.* Fr. 286 seems to be from Clytaemestra's injunctions to Iphigeneia on the eve of her supposed marriage; Fr. 287 a reference to the enforced waiting at Aulis.

Menelaus appears in the *Iph. Aul.* as the foil to Agamemnon's wavering instead of the stock character for these rôles, Odysseus. This gave several openings for Euripides' special genius: 304 cowardly bullying of the old man; 317 ff. quarrel between two brothers over the life of the daughter of one of them; 480 ff. Menelaus faces about, and he and Agamemnon reverse their positions of 317 ff. Menelaus thus furnishes the uncertainty of the first half of the play exactly as Achilles does that of the second. For neither does there appear an earlier parallel.

d) The chorus. Gellius, xix 10, says that the chorus in Ennius' play was composed of warriors. Welcker thinks Soph. Fr. 287 was spoken by the coryphaeus of such a chorus. In any case the lines contain a suggestion of the reason why Euripides introduced the chorus of sight-seeing girls. The play is one of intrigue between two parties. Now the natural components of the chorus would be a group of soldiers from the Greek army. But the army are bound, in the nature of the case, to take sides in the intrigue, namely, the side demanding that Iphigeneia shall

be killed. Compare the references to them 412-4, 514-25. Odysseus' power with the multitude, 1267-8, may recall incidents in the Sophoclean play. Thus some indifferent group of spectators must be brought in from elsewhere, and Euripides solves the problem with the maids from Euboea.

Mythological suspense here arises from: a) the introduction of Achilles and the love-story, and the emphasis on Menelaus; b) the introduction of the willing sacrifice idea from the Aglauros cult-story, new in drama, but carrying from its association with the cult the supposition that the sacrifice would be consummated; c) the bizarre chorus.

7. *Iphigeneia in Tauris.*

There are two clear early references for Iphigeneia's removal to the Taurians (*Cypr. ap. Procl.*; *Hdt. iv 103*). The evidence for the existence previous to Euripides of a story of her return thence to Greece is scattered and inconclusive. So far as I have been able to discover, it is:

a) Paus. iii 16, 7 (Sparta). *τὸ δὲ χωρίον τὸ ἐπονομαζόμενον Λιμναῖον Ὀρθίας ἱερόν ἐστιν Ἀρτέμιδος.* *τὸ ξόανον δὲ ἐκένοι εἶναι λέγουσιν ὃ ποτε Ὁρέστης καὶ Ἰφιγένεια ἐκ τῆς Ταυρικῆς ἐκκλέπτουσιν.* *ἐσ δὲ τὴν σφετέραν Λακεδαιμόνιοι κομισθῆναι φασιν Ὁρέστου καὶ ἐνταῦθα βασιλεύοντος.* *καὶ μοι εἰκότα λέγειν μᾶλλον τι δοκοῦσιν ἡ Ἀθηναῖοι.* *ποίω γάρ δὴ λόγω κατέλιπεν ἄν ἐν Βραυρῶνι Ἰφιγένεια τὸ ἄγαλμα;* *ἡ πῶς, ἡνίκα Ἀθηναῖοι τὴν χώραν ἐκλιπεῖν παρεσκενάζοντο, οὐκ ἐσέθεντο καὶ τοῦτο ἐς τὰς ναῦς;* *καίτοι διαμεμένηκεν ἔτι καὶ νῦν τηλικοῦτο ὄνομα τῇ Ταυρικῇ θεῷ, ὥστε ἀμφισβητοῦσι μὲν Καππαδόκαι οἱ τὸν Εὔξεινον οἰκοῦντες τὸ ἄγαλμα εἶναι παρὰ σφίσιν, ἀμφισβητοῦσι δὲ καὶ Λυδῶν οῖς ἐστὶν Ἀρτέμιδος ἱερὸν Ἀναιτίδος.* *Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ ἄρα παρώφητη γενόμενον λάφυρον τῷ Μήδῳ τὸ γάρ ἐκ Βραυρῶνος ἐκομίσθη τε ἐς Σοῦσα, καὶ ὑστερον Σελεύκου δόντος Σύριοι Λαοδικεῖς ἐφ' ἡμῶν ἔχοντι.* He goes on to state reasons why the real bretas is in Lacedaemon.

The real point is the story that the Tauric bretas was carried off by the Persians. If this be taken at its face value, there was in 480 at Brauron-Halai a bretas supposed to come from the Tauri. Robert (*Arch. Mär. ch. ix*) argues against so taking it. Clearly there was in Brauron in Euripides' day an ancient *xoanon* as there was in Pausanias' day; on this hypothesis it must have been a substitute. Where then did it come from, and how would Euripides have dared to allude to a story which was only

humiliating to the Athenians? Robert also shows that the older cult stories and names at Lacedaemon connected with the shrine of Iphigeneia do not square with the Taurian maiden but proceed from an earlier cult of Lygodesma. The story of an image carried off by the Persians was invented in Seleucus' time to give value and antiquity to a new image presented to the Syrians *from whom Pausanias got the story he tells.* In Euripides' time everyone believed the image then at Brauron to be an original cult-statue. Thus all the extant stories containing the return of Iphigeneia from the Tauri can be traced to Euripides' play. To this may be added the *argumentum ex silentio*, which is especially significant for Herodotus.

b) Hyg. *Fab.* 120 tells that Iphigeneia and Orestes after leaving the Tauri went to Sminthe, an island near the Troad, where they found old Chryses of the *Iliad*, Chryseis, and young Chryses, her son by Agamemnon. Old Chryses tells his grandson who the strangers are and their relationship to him. Meanwhile Thoas pursues the fugitives and the half-brothers combine to kill him. After that, Iphigeneia and Orestes proceed to Lacedaemon. The fragments of the *Chryses* of Pacuvius indicate that this was the subject of that play. Now there is also a play, *Chryses*, of Sophocles (fragments insignificant), which Welcker (*G. T.*, i 212) is certain is the model for Pacuvius' play. But he argues illegitimately from the unassigned Sophoclean fragment, now Nauck 668, τὰς Ἐκαταῖς μαγιδᾶς δόρπων. There are also traces in Pacuvius' play of the contest of unselfishness between Orestes and Pylades (*Iph. Taur.* 669–715), noticed by Wilamowitz, *Hermes* 1883, 249 ff., and his cosmological fragments are certainly Euripidean. Thus while we have definite evidence for Euripidean influence on Pacuvius' *Chryses*, the supposition of Sophoclean influence rests merely on the identity of names.

A difficulty still remains in accounting for the connection of Iphigeneia with Sminthe and Chryses, which must be of Greek origin. A hint as to the source of this comes from the cults that lie behind the myths. Chryse of the Troad (see Corssen in *Philol.* 1907, 346 ff.; Roscher *s.v. Chryse* and *Iphigeneia*; Farnell, *Cults of the Greek States*, *s.v. Artemis Iphigeneia*) and Iphigeneia of Brauron-Halai are similar chthonian goddesses associated with propitiatory sacrifices, and it is conceivable that Iphigeneia

might become a visitant at Chryse or Sminthe (Hyg. *Fab.* 120; cf. *Il.* I 39) as she did in the Tauric Chersonese, to a kindred foreign divinity. (Tzetzes on *Lyc.* 183 makes Iphigeneia and Chryses brother and sister, children of Agamennon and Chryseis.) But there is no trace of this in early Greek literature; the *Cypria* contained only the removal to the Taurians, and the *Catalogue of Women*, the only other poem where such a tradition would be likely to be perpetuated, gave a still more primitive version (cf. Wilam. *Herm.* 1883, *l.c.*), which ignores the Taurian story, and in which Iphigeneia's former divinity remains undisguised;—*viz.* by the will of Artemis, she (after the sacrifice) became Hecate (Philodem. *de Vel.* 24; Stes. Fr. 37 B, Bergk³; Paus. i 43). This version was followed by Stesichorus. On the other hand, Iphigeneia's wanderings after leaving the Tauri were by later writers variously elaborated out of local tales (Paus. iii 16, 6; i 33, 1; i 43, 1; Strab. xii 535), just as the chivalrous action of Achilles in the *Iph. Aul.* initiated a cycle of romantic stories about the pair (Ammian. xxii 8, 34 f.; Tzetz. on *Lyc.* 183; *schol.* and Eustath. *ad Il.* XIX 326; Eustath. *ad Dionys.* P. 306), and our evidence would seem to put the story of Iphigeneia's visit to the Troad in this class.

Thus until the first mention of Athens occurs (1083) there is suspense as to: a) whether they will be saved; b) where they will go if they are saved.

We may glance at certain elements in our play:

a) 669–716. The contest between Orestes and Pylades as to which shall be sacrificed is an echo of the willing sacrifice theme, the origin of which we have already examined. With 678–83 cf. Soph. *Ai.* 1012–20. Teucer and Pylades each fear the accusation of having had a hand in a friend's death.

b) 727–826 is occupied with the anagnorisis; 904–1088 with a planning scene.

c) In 1152 ff. the plan is put into execution. It consists of the bretas-washing idea derived from some cult, probably the Athenian one of the Plynteria. Aglauros, who was associated with the Plynteria, influences Euripides elsewhere as we have seen.

d) In 1391 ff. the escaping vessel is held up at the mouth of the bay by a sea wind and driven on the rocks. This is natural but unnecessary. In the *Cyclops* and the *Helen* escapes by sea

occur without the help of a god. Obviously Euripides intended to have a *deus ex machina* in the *Iph. Taur.*, and the reverse (1391) is inserted to keep up suspense until it began. The special purpose with which this *deus* is introduced is to prove a connection between two similar cults, those of Halai and Brauron. Halai is located in the lines:

1450: χῶρός τις ἔστιν Ἀτθίδος πρὸς ἐσχάτοις
 ὅροισι, γείτων δειράδος Καρυστίας
 ἰερός. Ἄλας νῦν οὐμὸς ὄνομάζει λεώς.

Here the bretas of Artemis is to be settled under the name of Tauropolos with a ceremony commemorative of the old Taurian sacrifices. The Brauronian temple, however, where was the tomb of Iphigeneia, was known to the audience, and it needs only an allusion:

σὲ δ' ἀμφὶ σεμνάς, Ἰφιγένεια, κλίμακας
Βραυρωνίας δεῦ τῷδε κληδουχεῖν θεᾶ.

(See Paus. i 33 and Fraser's notes for Brauron and Halai and their probable location.)

The bear-dances are not mentioned because they are harder to explain. Thus the suggestion for this speech and for the whole play lay in the juxtaposition of these facts: the story of a cult among the Tauri connected with both Iphigeneia and Artemis; Artemis Tauropolos at Brauron; and a grave of Iphigeneia at Brauron. The pains taken by Euripides to introduce and emphasize the divine speech would indicate that the facts had not been handled together before.

Suspense appears throughout the play, as in the *Orestes* and the *Helen*, at its maximum through the handling of a brand new situation. The grave of Iphigeneia at Brauron was not a sufficiently conspicuous cult to give many of the audience any hint about her fleeing there. As was noted under the *Eumenides* all these characters have rather dropped out of the legend; Iphigeneia since her removal to the Taurians; Orestes and Pylades since the death of Clytaemestra. Euripides carefully includes all the known later history of Orestes as occurring prior to the action (939 ff.), so that the audience will have no lead as to the outcome of this action. Thus the poet could elaborate or even conclude the life of any one of them practically at will. In this con-

nection is to be noted the poet's preference for a happy ending, where one was not driven into the opposite by the saga.

Note the introduction of two cult themes, the bretas-washing and the willing sacrifice. The latter theme in all the other stories is consummated, a fact which leads one to suspect that it will be consummated here and hence produces the suspense of False Lead. The bretas-washing, being pure ritual, gave no lead as to its results as a stratagem.

8. Helen.

The white-washing of Helen was developed by Stesichorus from a suggestion in some Hesiodic poem.¹ For the content of Stesichorus' παλινώδια see Tzetzes ad *Lyc.*, 113. λέγουσι γάρ ὅτι διερχομένω 'Αλεξάνδρῳ δι' Αἴγυπτου ὁ Πρωτεὺς Ἐλένην ἀφελόμενος, εἴδωλον Ἐλένης αὐτῷ δέδωκεν, καὶ οὕτως ἐπλευσεν εἰς Τροίαν, ώς φησὶ Στησίχορος. *Schol.* to Aristides, iii 150 . . . Στησίχορον . . . λέγει γάρ ἐκεῖνος ὅτι ἐλθὼν ὁ Ἀλέξανδρος ἐπὶ ταύτης τῆς νήσου τῆς Φάρου, ἀφρέθη παρὰ τοῦ Πρωτέως τὴν Ἐλένην καὶ εἴδωλον αὐτῆς ἐδέξατο. Cf. Dio. Chrys., *Or.* xi 182. καὶ τὸν μὲν Στησίχορον ἐν τῇ ὕστερον ὡδῇ λέγειν ὅτι τὸ παράπαν οὐδὲ πλεύσειεν ἡ Ἐλένη οὐδαμόσε, ἄλλοι δέ τινες ὅτι ἀρπασθείη μὲν Ἐλένη ὑπὸ Ἀλεξάνδρου, δεῦρο δὲ παρ' ἥμᾶς εἰς Αἴγυπτον ἀφίκετο.

The second version is right, namely, that Helen did not sail at all, for it alone exonerates Helen and comports with the second line of the fragment (26 Bergk³):

οὐκ ἔστ' ἔτυμος λόγος οὗτος
οὐδ' ἔβας ἐν ναυσὶν εὐσέλμοις
οὐδ' ἵκε Πέργαμα Τροίας.

Stesichorus, however, did use the image (*Pl. Rep.* 586 C); where Helen spent the intervening time herself is a question. Mayer² argues probably rightly that Stesichorus invented the story preserved in the prologue of our play, and that Helen was miraculously transported to Egypt. She could not have stayed at home, and the only other place associated with her, Leuke (supposed by Welcker and Duhn to have been used by Stesichorus), appears

¹ *Schol. Lyc.* 822 πρῶτος Ἡσίοδος περὶ τῆς Ἐλένης τὸ εἴδωλον παρήγαγε. Mayer changes Ἡσίοδος to Στησίχορος. The manuscript reading is defended by von Premerstein.

² Max Mayer, *De Euripidis Mythopoeia*, 1883.

only in late stories, while even in the *Odyssey* she is said to have gone to Egypt (IV, 125; 228). Cf. *Il.* VI, 289, where she went to Sidon, which was confused by the ancients with Egypt. Cf. *Od.* IV, 83; V, 282–3. If she went to Egypt and did not board a ship, there was probably something miraculous about it, and whether or not Hermes was the agent does not much matter.

The play thus begins where Stesichorus left the story, for we have no certain evidence for an earlier tale of Menelaus' recovery of Helen that fits on to the *παλνώδια*, but from Stesichorus may proceed the version in Apollodorus, p. 226 Wagner, where Menelaus finds Helen with Proteus. In this passage two sources are implicitly quoted. According to 1) he reached Egypt with five ships; in 2) he finds Proteus living. Thus we have two variants from Euripides, not one. It is hence unmethodic to clap these two together and father them on Stesichorus without further ado, as is done by von Premerstein, *Philol.* 1896, 642. The *Helen* is an original story pieced together out of the poet's fancy and a quaint conflation of *Od.* IV, 351–586; the rationalist account in Hdt. ii 113 ff.; the plot of the *Iph. Taur.*, and very likely obscure legends now lost. According to Lyc. 820 ff. the *eidolon* left Menelaus shortly after he had put out from the Troad, and his search for her occasions his wanderings. Von Premerstein (*l.c.*) supposes this to have been the Stesichorean version, and that Euripides retained the *eidolon* till the middle of his play to create suspense. Euripides' handling of this is undoubtedly effective, but we are not entitled to posit an earlier version as certain.

Another conventional theme, the hero in rags, appears here, but its contribution to suspense is doubtful. The best discussion of this is in Ar. *Ach.* 412–70.

From Herodotus, Euripides got the location, a palace (a temple in Herodotus) on the Canobic mouth of the Nile, overlooking the river but near the sea (Hdt. ii 113, 2; *Hel.* 1), and the germ of the sanctuary idea (Hdt. ii 113, 2–3; *Hel.* 64). Proteus is made a king as in Herodotus, not a sea-god as in the *Odyssey*, but the story (Hdt. ii 119, 2–3) of a righteous barbarian and a rascally Greek, though dramatically possible, would have been an offence to Greek taste. Thus the son of Proteus becomes the central figure with a disposition modeled on that of Thoas—the conventional barbarian king. In Herodotus the temple

where Helen was cast up and the king's palace are kept separate. In a play they must be run together or one of them discarded. So the temple sanctuary becomes a tomb only (cf. Ar. *Thesm.* 886-8), no longer that of Heracles, but that of Proteus himself, in order to give a palpable basis to the arguments used by Helen and Menelaus against Theonoe. In place of the Herodotean warden of the temple named Thonis (cf. *Od.* IV, 228), the Homeric daughter of Proteus is humanized and her name Eidothea¹ translated into Theonoe, perhaps by the similarity of sound to Thonis. She is naturally, being the daughter of Proteus, the sister of the king's son, but the omniscience of her Homeric father is bestowed upon her as a device to create suspense. Much of the play is pure humor, e.g. 386-475. The mock-burial of Menelaus occupies the place of the bretas-washing in the *Iph. Taur.* involving the suspense of persuasion by a very thin story. The previous stage of planning suggests the earlier play. With *Hel.* 1043-6 compare *Iph. Taur.* 1020-3.

Teucer is introduced in the prologue; 1) to give us the Greek point of view, 71 ff., and thus quicken curiosity as to how Menelaus will react at first towards his re-discovered wife; and 2) to acquaint us of the danger to any Greek who appears on these shores (151-7), at the same time suggesting that Menelaus may possibly appear. There was no improbability in his appearing in Egypt on the way from Salamis to Cyprus. The idea of sacrificing all Greeks, copied from the *Iph. Taur.*, is weakly motivated in lines 468-70.

Thus the play contains three principal themes: 1) anagnorisis, a stock in trade; 2) the omniscient Theonoe and the winning of her support, developed as was seen out of the *Odyssey* and Herodotus; 3) the escape, an adaptation of one of the poet's own previous works.

The only real indications which the audience had as to the outcome of this play from the beginning were: a) the general datum that Menelaus and Helen ended their days in peace at Sparta; b) the general similarity to the situation in the *Iph. Taur.*, a probably earlier play (Bruhn, ed. *Helen*, p. 11 ff.). The other themes, Theonoe, Teucer, the sanctuary of Proteus, the *eidolon*, were

¹ Cf. *schol. Od.* IV 366. καὶ Λισχύλος ἐν Πρωτεῖ Εἰδοθέαν αὐτὴν καλεῖ. *Etym. Gud.*, p. 316, 30. ὑποκοριστικῶς ὡς παρ' Λισχύλῳ ἡ Εἰδώλω.

picked up from sources too scattered and obscure to give the audience any lead as to their outcome. Thus the suspense, as in the *Iph. Taur.*, is practically complete from the beginning.

9. *Andromache*.

Except for the murder of Neoptolemus at Delphi, the plot of the *Andromache* is practically new. In it Euripides tries the effect of combining elements already given independently of one another in the history of Neoptolemus. The chief elements are:

a) Andromache as Neoptolemus' captive; *Nostoi* and *Iliup. ap.* Procl.; *Ilias Parva* Fr. 18 K.; cf. Paus. i, 11, 1;

b) The marriage of Hermione to Neoptolemus is in *Od.* IV, 4 ff., where Menelaus sends Hermione to Neoptolemus in fulfilment of a promise made at Troy. There is no mention of Neoptolemus' death. Compare also Pherecydes *ap. schol.* Eur. *Or.* 1655. Φερεκύδης δέ φησι περὶ παιδῶν χρησμὸν αἰτοῦντα τὸν Νεοπτόλεμον ἀναιρεθῆναι. ἐπεὶ Νεοπτόλεμος Ἐρμιόνην γαμεῖ τὴν Μενελάου καὶ ἔρχεται εἰς Δελφοὺς περὶ παιδῶν χρησόμενος, οὐ γάρ ἐγένοντο ἐξ Ἐρμιόνης. . . .

c) The death of Neoptolemus at Delphi.

Pherec. *l.c.* . . . καὶ ὁρᾶ κατὰ χρηστήριον κρέα διαρπάζοντας τοὺς Δελφούς, ἀφαιρεῖται τὰ κρέα αὐτούς, αὐτὸν δὲ κτείνει Μαχαιρεὺς ὁ τούτων ἵερεὺς καὶ κατορύσσει¹ αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τὸν οὐδὸν τοῦ νεῶ. ταῦτα γενεαλογεῖ καὶ Σοφοκλῆς.

Pind. *N.* vii 40 ff.

[Νεοπτόλεμος] ὥχετο δὲ πρὸς θεόν,
κτέαν' ἄγων Τρωίαθεν ἀκροθινίων
ἴνα κρεῶν νιν ὑπὲρ μάχας ἔλασεν
ἀντιτυχόντ' ἀνὴρ μαχαίρᾳ.

βάρυνθεν δὲ περισσὰ Δελφοὶ ξεναγέται
ἄλλὰ τὸ μόρσιμον ἀπέδωκεν· ἔχρην δὲ τιν' ἐνδον ἄλσει παλαιτάτῳ
Αἰακιδᾶν κρεόντων τὸ λοιπὸν ἔμμεναι
θεοῦ παρ' εύτειχέα δόμον. ἡρωῖαι δὲ πομπαῖς θεμίσκοπον οἰκεῖν.

Pind. *Paean.* vi 105 ff.

ἄλλ' οὕτε ματέρ' ἐπειτα κεδνὰν
ἔϋδεν οὕτε πατρω-
ταῖς ἐν ἀρούραις
ἴππους Μυρμιδόνων

¹ Leopardus for ms. ἔαυτὸν δὲ κτείνει μαχάίρᾳ· ὃ δὲ τούτων ἱερεὺς κατορύσσει. Cf. Eust. ad *Od.*, p. 1479–80.

χαλκοκορυστὰν
 ὅμιλον ἐγέίρων . . .
 ὥμοσε γάρ θέσ,
 γεραιὸν δὲ Πρίαμον
 πρὸς ἔρκειον ἡναρε βωμὸν ἐ-
 πενθορόντα μή νιν ἐῦφρον' ἐς οἱ[κ]ον
 μῆτ' ἐπὶ γῆρας ἵξε-
 μεν βίου· ἀμφιπόλοις δὲ
 [κ]υρ[ιᾶν] περὶ τιμᾶν
 [δηρο]αῖς ὄμενον κτάνεν
 [$\langle \text{ἐν} \rangle$ τεμέ]νει φίλῳ γᾶς
 παρ' ὄμφαλὸν εύριν.

The last reference indicates the source of the story of Neoptolemus' death. It was one circulated by the Delphian priests, to whom the murder of Priam was repugnant (*Iliup. ap.* Procl.). The order will thus probably be: 1) death-story as above; 2) a grave of Neoptolemus shown at Delphi to confirm the story; 3) legend of an Aeacid buried at Delphi, partially whitewashing Neoptolemus (*N.* vii 44). Neoptolemus is here only *ἡρωῖαις πομπαῖς θεμίσκοπος*, a vague office. He is not in receipt of offerings, and this shows that the grave is a late thing, not the relic of an ancient cult (cf. Paus. x, 24, 6). The motivation in the Delphian story is impossible. Neoptolemus goes to Delphi because Apollo wishes him to do so; Pherecydes, or his source, saw the explanation for this in the lack of any genealogy ascribing offspring to his union with Hermione and brings in the familiar theme of consulting the oracle about children. The important innovation we find in the drama is the marriage of Orestes with Hermione. That this rested on an earlier story of some sort seems probable from the fact that the Sophoclean version is apparently the earlier, and radical innovations in the plot are not in the manner of the Sophocles known to us.¹ But in any case the direct par-

¹ Eust. *ad Od.*, p. 1479, 10. In Soph. *Herm.*, Hermione was given by Tyndareus to Orestes. But Menelaus promised her to Neoptolemus at Troy, and after the war she was taken away from Orestes and given to him. After the latter's death she reverted to Orestes. There are no sure means of telling whether this or Euripides' version is the older; a radical innovation in the legend is more after the manner of Euripides. But the story in Sophocles seems a less closely knit one:—Neoptolemus killed as in Pindar; Hermione already married to Orestes when the war ends—and therefore presumably earlier.

ticipation of Orestes in the murder of Achilles' son is almost certainly Euripides' invention. This incident deserves a moment's notice. The character of Orestes in this play is one familiar to us from Soph. *El.* and Eur. *Or.*—harsh, fanatical and vindictive. This character is not developed in our play but assumed from some earlier treatment, which could only rest upon the mother-murder. No such treatment appears in Aeschylus or in Eur. *El.* In the first, Orestes is the passive instrument of Apollo; in the other, wavering and soft-hearted, requiring to be pushed at every step. Our play can hardly be later than 408 B.C., and the conclusion follows that it must be later than the undated Sophoclean *Electra* unless Euripides was influenced by a now unknown work of some minor dramatist. The parallels between the two plays are inconclusive. The scene 881 ff. vaguely suggests an anagnorisis with Electra. Cf. *Andr.* 896–7 with Soph. *El.* 80; *Andr.* 881–2 with Soph. *El.* 660–1 (both conventional tags).

The action of Andromache (1–546) as a suppliant is quite new; it is a development of the common suppliant-theme, which could be brought in wherever there was a clash between a weaker and stronger party (see later; also Dieterich, *Pulcinella*, p. 9 ff.). The clash between two women was the sort of thing Euripides would naturally think of; the datum of Pherecydes that Hermione had no children appears as motivation 32–5, 157–8. Menelaus appears in order to strengthen Hernione's hand and make a suppliant-play plausible; there is no earlier reference for his appearance here. Similarly Peleus, like Heracles, is the rescuer which a suppliant-play demands. In the *Iliad* Peleus is merely Achilles' father; Achilles does not even know whether or not he is alive (*Il.* XIX, 334). But in the *Nostoi* (Procl.) Peleus meets Neoptolemus on his return, and there is no difficulty about bringing him in here. The attempted suicide of Hermione, a momentary false lead (811 ff.) and new to this play, like the attack on Andromache, springs from Hermione's vile disposition. This disposition is created for the play and made additionally plausible by its appropriateness as an attack on Sparta. The murder of Neoptolemus by Orestes is new in Euripides and is introduced to knit the threads of the play more closely together. Neoptolemus' errand is noted in the prologue (49–55) with a new motiva-

tion; after this his absence is noted only as bearing on Andromache. We do not expect his return, for in 79 ff. Andromache sends for Peleus; this means that the grandfather will be the rescuer, not Neoptolemus himself. Orestes' connivance enables him (995 ff.) to predict the murder and thus bring it into the main action of our play.

There is thus a high probability that things would end about as they did: *i.e.* that Neoptolemus would perish; that Hermione would go off with Orestes; and that Andromache would be rescued into some vague "lived-happily-ever-after" arrangement and drop out of the saga. The suspense rises from the novelty of the situations: Menelaus and Peleus; Andromache and Hermione, quarreling; Orestes appearing in Thessaly, establishing an unheroic and clandestine understanding with Hermione, and departing with veiled menaces against his rival. The suspense of these scenes arises and progresses from their own content and thus gets clear of the saga-compulsion, which is lost to view as the play proceeds. It should be kept in mind that treatment of this kind was only possible with myths that were weak in detail and less current than the *Oresteia*.

III. THE THEBAN STORIES.

The history of this set of myths has been so thoroughly investigated and admirably presented by Robert in his *Oedipus* that little need be done here beyond fitting his results to our study. The use of his book will be assumed throughout this section.

1. *Oedipus Tyrannus*.

This play is entirely devoted to an anagnorisis. In such a unique plot incidents have to be crowded in from other sources or invented, and these we shall summarize:

a) The herdsmen and the double anagnorisis. The only previous form of the anagnorisis known to us is the simple one sketched in *Od.* XI, 274. In addition to this, Robert believes that *O. T.* 1032, *ποδοῦν ἀν ἄρθρα μαρτυρήσειν τὰ σά*, points to a version where this was the only means of the anagnorisis. It is the only evidence we have, and as it is unnecessary here, it is

probably a reference to some earlier story. In the *Thebais*, time was allowed for Oedipus to have children,¹ and it is hard to see how this could have been done if the swollen feet were alone used. Probably the oracle or Teiresias entered as well, or recognition was effected by exchange of confidences as in the Pisander *schol.* to *Phoen.* 1760.

The entry of herdsmen into the play is perhaps Sophoclean. Robert argues that Oedipus was reared among the shepherds of Cithaeron in the Aeschylean trilogy, but the only pre-tragie source for his early history is the Euphorbus vase (p. 73), which represents him carried in the arms of a young nobleman, could fit only his rearing at some court, and would exclude the shepherds altogether. This is, however, too uncertain ground to be profitable for us. We do not even know whether or not Aeschylus handled the anagnorisis; Robert's reconstruction of the trilogy, excluding it, is built around the *a priori* statement (p. 274 ff.) that Aeschylus must have handled Oedipus' *death* in a play. But surely, on his own showing, this is a most hazy feature, which admits the greatest variation in the earlier stories. Both Sophocles in the *Oedipus Tyrannus* and Euripides in the *Phoenissae* seem uncertain about the death, while the anagnorisis idea is the most obvious theme for a tragedy in this whole "cycle". Thus the suspense on the appearance of the first shepherd rises, as throughout Euripides' *Andromache*, from the situation itself and frees itself from the data of the saga.

b) The plague. There is no earlier source for this,² and it was probably invented by Sophocles. It furnishes the initial impulse that disturbs the *status quo*. Observe that the *initial scene* does not contain the initial impulse, which lies before the play opens. Oedipus has sent to Delphi, and hence the prologue is merely exposition. This is to save time. From the plague spring the appeals to Delphi and to Teiresias, who is also new in this connection. In the ancient story Teiresias probably figured alone; Delphi substituted itself for him at the time when it remodeled many of the ancient myths.³ The Teiresias scene is

¹ For the various names of Oedipus' wife see Robert, p. 109. Robert maintains that they are all variants for the same person and that in no story was Oedipus married more than once.

² Robert, p. 69, suggests that the idea was borrowed from *Iliad*, I 48-83.

³ See Robert, p. 68 ff.

remarkable in that it contains the whole content of the anagnorisis, even to Oedipus' subsequent wandering. (Robert, p. 290. Note lines 350-4, 362, 366-7, 413-23, 449-60.) This in a play where the issue is bound to be foreknown, so far from diminishing suspense, actually stimulates it, for it puts Oedipus in his incredulity under a cloud of $\alpha\tau\eta$ that adds a horror and wonder to the general effect. As the Teiresias scene follows on the plague, so the quarrel with Creon springs inevitably out of Teiresias' statements. For Oedipus to hear this clear speaking and remain absolutely confident of his own position, it is necessary to make him pitch on some particularly violent line of reasoning,¹ which by a single basic assumption sweeps Teiresias out of consideration. This line is supplied by the notion that the seer is party to a plot (346-9; 385 ff.; cf. 124). This misguided theme supplies suspense for a certain distance. Note that it, like the investigation into the murder of Laius, is never expressly concluded. Both are swallowed up from 1016 in the supreme issue of Oedipus' birth. The function of the plague is to start the suspense along new lines, foreign to the old story, and, as we shall see in a moment, to introduce the sentence on the murderer of Laius, upon which Oedipus' fate is made to depend.

e) Iocaste. In *Od.* XI, 277-8 Iocaste hangs herself after the anagnorisis; she is not present in the *Seven against Thebes* (see Robert, p. 263), and therefore she must have died at this time in the Aeschylean trilogy. But in some version prevalent before the dramatists, which one naturally infers to be the *Thebais*, she was present at the war and mourned the conflict of her sons. (Paus. ix 4, 2; ix 5, 11 καὶ Ὀρασίας Πλαταιάσιν ἔγραψε κατηφῇ τὴν Εὐρυγάνειαν ἐπὶ τῇ μάχῃ τῶν παιδῶν. This is assuming the identity of Iocaste and Eurygancia. See Robert, p. 180 ff.)

Sophocles had this choice. The manner of her going strongly suggests the suicide, 1072-5. Note the cryptic $\alpha\lambda\lambda\delta'$ οὐποθ' $\bar{\nu}\sigma\tau\epsilon\rho\nu$. The chorus then utters a conventional warning (cf. *Ant.* 1244-5; 766-7; *Trach.* 813-4). Suspense about Iocaste gets no clear lead from the saga, because there were two conflicting stories. Thus it develops out of the play itself, like the suspense concerning Oedipus' fate.

¹ See Robert's keen analysis of Oedipus' reasoning, p. 293 ff.

d) Future of Oedipus. In the earliest version, which lay back of *Il.* XXIII, 678; *Od.* XI, 279–80; Hes. *Erg.* 161–5; *Eoiae*, frs. 99 A and 99 Evelyn-White, Oedipus had a long and stormy career as King of Thebes after the anagnorisis and the death of his wife, fell in battle against the Minyaean, and was buried with appropriate magnificence (Robert, p. 112 ff.).

The dramatists preserve two versions which exclude the former:

1. Soph., *O. T.* 421, 454, 1451–4, 1436–9; cf. 236 ff., 816 ff., 1340, 1381 ff., *O. C.*, 3 ff. Oedipus goes, a blind, wandering beggar, first over Cithaeron, later throughout Hellas.

2. Euripides, *Phoen.* 64 ff.; cf. *O. T.* 1424. Oedipus is kept a prisoner in the house as being too polluted for the light of the sun to look upon.

Robert believes both of these to be echoes of “eine uralte, über das Epos zurückreichende Sagenform” (p. 17). This he bases on the necessity of perpetuating in the human successor the sufferings of the old year-god. This only concerns us in so far as variants to this effect existed at the time the *Oedipus Tyrannus* appeared. For the wandering, there seems to be no earlier evidence, although Robert (p. 17) believes it to have been a part of the earliest saga. The *Thebais* fragments (2 and 3 Evelyn-White) present the same picture as the *Phoenissae*, a blind (cf. φράσθη fr. 2; ἐνόησε fr. 3) old man living on in the palace dependent on his sons and impotent except for his power to curse. The blindness was kept by Aeschylus (*Sept.* 783 f.). Of the two curses in the *Thebais*, Aeschylus kept only the first and milder one (Robert, p. 264 ff.); this may argue a curtailment of his life, but there is no evidence as to when or where he died.

Now if we examine the passages in the *Oedipus Tyrannus* bearing on Oedipus' wandering, three things appear:

1. Oedipus' banishment is the consequence of the sentence already passed on the unknown murderer of Laius, 236 ff.; 816 ff.; 1381 ff. 350–3. This sentence grows out of the plague theme, which, as we saw, was Sophocles' own peculiar way of initiating the action.

2. It is also a projection of Oedipus' exposure in youth, 1452–4:

οὐμὸς Κιθαιρών οῦτος, ὃν μήτηρ τέ μοι
πατήρ τ' ἐθέσθην ξῶντι κύριον τάφον,
ἴν' ἔξ ἐκείνων, οἵ μ' ἀπωλλύτην θάνω.

3. Further it is a fulfilment of part of the purpose with which Oedipus was incarcerated in the *Thebais* and *Phoenissae*, 1436 f.:

φίψόν με γῆς ἐκ τῆσδ' ὅσον τάχισθ', ὅπου
θυητῶν φανοῦμαι μηδενὸς προσήγορος.

Thus there is no mention after the anagnorisis of beggary in populated Hellas. Before that, the only mention made is in 455 *πτωχὸς ἀντὶ πλουσίου*, where the former word is chiefly for contrast to the latter. Cf. 1451 ἔα με ναῖειν ὅρεσιν. Cf. 248 *κακῶς νιν ἄμορον ἐκτρίψαι βίον*, and *κύριον τάφον* above, of Cithaeron. In fact, the exile, as implied in the *Oedipus Tyrannus*, means a desolate wandering in the wilderness, ending inevitably in a lonely death within a few days. Compare *Ant.* 50-1.

. . . πατήρ
ώς νῷν ἀπεχθῆς δυσκλεής τ' ἀπώλετο,
πρὸς αὐτοφώρων ἀμπλακημάτων, διπλᾶς
ὅψεις ἀράξας αὐτὸς αὐτουργῷ χερί.

This version would fit neither into any cult story nor into any consecutive treatment of the whole saga, of which we have evidence. Therefore the probability is that Sophocles invented it. Thus while Oedipus may have been represented, before this play, as a blind wanderer, there is no solid evidence for it and the theme in the *Oedipus Tyrannus* is developed purely out of the play itself. The bearing on suspense is obvious. At the outset our minds are directed to the coming fate of Oedipus by a new motive, *viz.*, the anonymous condemnation to exile of the murderer. Teiresias fixes this on the king. Cithaeron is mentioned first in a vague suggestion, after the manner of Aeschylus (421). Thus a suspense of real uncertainty is kept up over the anagnorisis and angelia. We wonder how, after the blinding, this banishment sentence can be carried out, until we discover (1451 ff.) that Oedipus intends to visit it on himself strictly and literally; of its full hideousness he only leaves us to imagine—

οὐ γὰρ ἂν ποτε
θνήσκων ἐσώθην, μὴ πὶ τῷ δεινῷ κακῷ.

Creon's scruple in 1518 *τοῦ θεοῦ μ' αἰτεῖς δόσιν*, does not weigh against Teiresias' prophecy.

The best comment on this exodus is *O. C.*, 431 ff., 765 ff., from which it appears that Oedipus is indeed sent into banish-

ment after the anagnorisis, but not immediately; that is, not in the mood in which he was exhibited to us when

ἢδιστον δέ μοι
τὸ κατθανεῖν ἦν καὶ τὸ λευσθῆναι πέτροις,

and when death would have been the inevitable consequence of his departure. What is almost certainly a criticism of the exodus of the *Oedipus Tyrannus* appears in Eur. *Phoen.* 1620 f.,

τί μ' ἄρδην ὡδὸν ἀποκτείνεις, Κρέον;
ἀποκτενεῖς γάρ, εἴ με γῆς ἔξω βαλεῖς.

Euripides finds his way out of the difficulty here by inventing Antigone's part as that of guide and help in place of Iocaste—*ἄ πόδα σὸν τυφλόποντι θεραπέύμασιν αἰὲν ἐμόχθει* (*Phoen.* 1549). Similarly for Euripides' *Oedipus* Robert makes out a strong probability that Iocaste there followed him into exile (p. 314 ff.). But Antigone has not yet announced her intention (1679) of going with her father when *Phoen.* 1620–1 are spoken, so that the words of those lines have their full force. The passages quoted in the *Oedipus Coloneus* as well as the introduction of Antigone and Ismene as caring for and accompanying Oedipus show that Sophocles accepted this criticism.

In the *Oedipus Tyrannus* the suspense regarding the fate of Oedipus naturally falls between three lines: imprisonment, exile, or suicide; and exile is the least obvious of the three. The issue is quite uncertain, and the actual conclusion develops by successive hints, none of them very obvious, out of the action itself. The suspense is acute on this point during the entire play and is admirably sustained by vague hints, not by any clear plan or prediction.

2. *Seven against Thebes.*

The story of an attack on Thebes instigated by Polyneices and led by Adrastus was handled in the *Thebais* and alluded to in *Il.* IV, 365 ff. and V, 800 ff., ending in the defeat of the attackers and the death of most of their champions (*Theb.*, fr. 4, 5, 7 Evelyn-White). Oedipus condemned his sons to death at each other's hands in a curse (fr. 3), which was certainly fulfilled. There is thus no novelty as regards essentials in the Aeschylean play. A few incidents may be noted:

a) Form of the curse. *Theb.* fr. 3—

εὑκτο Διὶ βασιλῆι καὶ ἄλλοις ἀθανάτοισι
χερσὶν ὑπ' ἄλλήλων καταβήμεναι "Αἰδος εῖσω.

Robert (p. 264 ff.) believes that Aeschylus suppressed, in the preceding plays of the Theban trilogy, this second and grimmer form of the curse, keeping only the first, *ibid.* fr. 2.

ώς οὐ οἱ πατρῶι' ἐν ἡθείῃ φιλότητι
δάσσαιντ', ἀμφοτέροισι δ' αἱ πόλεμοι τε μάχαι τε . . .

cf. *Sept.* 785 ff.

τέκνοις δ' ἀγρίας
έφῆκεν ἐπικότους τροφᾶς,
αἰαῖ, πικρογλώσσους ἀράς,
καὶ σφε σιδαρονόμῳ
διὰ χερί ποτε λαχεῖν
κτήματα,

and cites Eteocles' words in going out to battle, which clearly indicate that the issue of the duel was in doubt, to him at least; cf. 69 ff., 659 ff., 683 ff. This is thoroughly in the manner of the *Oresteia* and would make a much better play, for it introduces an element of uncertainty as to the outcome of the brother-duel and at the same time makes the play more impressive ethically by emphasizing human motive at each step. At best, however, it is only an attractive possibility. Robert has to explain away (pp. 266-7) the lines 689-91

ἐπεὶ τὸ πρᾶγμα κάρτ' ἐπισπέρχει θεός,
ἴτω κατ' οὐρον κῦμα Κωκύτου λαχὸν
Φοίβῳ στυγηθὲν πᾶν τὸ Λαῖτον γένος,

and 819-20

ἔξουσι δ' ἦν λάβωσιν ἐν ταφῇ χθόνα
πατρὸς κατ' εὐχὰς δυσπότμους φορούμενοι.

The first line sounds like an echo of the text of an actual curse; cf. *O. C.* 789-90.

b) The pairing of the combatants. The exact pairing of champion with champion was introduced by Aeschylus (Robert, p. 244 ff.; cf. the story of Tydeus, p. 130 ff.), obviously to lead up to the announcement of the duel between the brothers. It was the natural mechanical means to let this be known to the audience before the battle. Otherwise the brothers would only quietly

seek each other out in the mêlée and we should know nothing till after the event. Note the shift of Polyneices from fourth place, which he had in the row of statues dedicated at Delphi by the Argives after the battle of Oenoe (Paus. x 10, 3), to the dramatic place of honor, namely the last. Robert discusses this list on p. 237 ff. and p. 244, and gives what he believes to be the true list for the *Thebais*. They do not differ materially so far as Polyneices is concerned. In Robert's list he is placed fifth. In the statues of the Epigoni at Argos (Paus. ii 20, 7) the sons of Polyneices come last. These statues are undated; Pausanias says in a parenthesis "for the Argives followed Aeschylus' poetry," but the list given is not that of Aeschylus' *Seven*.

c) 587-9. Amphiaraus predicts his own death. A different version appears in Pindar *N.* ix, 16 ff. The sons of Talaus lead an army against Thebes. Zeus tried to deter them by an ill-omened thunderbolt as they were setting out. All the heroes were killed; Amphiaraus was saved from death at the hands of Periclymenus by being swallowed up in the earth; but there is no mention of his having predicted his own death. In *Od.* VI 13, Amphiaraus is a prophet. In *Od.* XI, 326-7; XV, 246-7 allusion is made to the story of Eriphyle, who was bribed into betraying her husband (cf. *schol. ad loc.*; Apollod. iii 6, 2, 4; Diodor. iv 65, 6). It is likely enough that the story of Amphiaraus' prediction of his own death was not part of the *Odyssey*¹ version, although there is no reference to it that I can find earlier than our play. Eriphyle in the act of being bribed by Polyneices appears on a vase (Robert, p. 209). On the Cypselus chest (Paus. v 17, 7) she appears with the necklace, at the departure of Amphiaraus, and a similar scene is on an archaic vase reproduced in Roscher s.v. *Amphiaraus*. Of the other Argive heroes, Tydeus was familiar from *Il.* IV, 365 and VII, 800. The exact names of the seven in the *Thebais* are uncertain, but the more individualized, Tydeus, Capaneus, Amphiaraus, Polyneices, were certainly there, and their boasts and appearance might suggest to the audience their exploits and fate in the last battle. But for all this, Aeschylus is our earliest source. Robert believes that the series of Etruscan urns (p. 228 ff.) represents a tradition that can be traced

¹ Hes. *Cat.* fr. 99 Evelyn-White is too fragmentary to be certain evidence, though it seems to contain this story.

indirectly to the *Thebais*, but this is too uncertain to be of use to us.

For the spurious closing scene of this play, see Robert, p. 375 ff.

The results from this play are not satisfactory. The only mythological suspense that could arise would concern: a) the fate of the city which, as all stories agreed and everyone knew, was saved; b) the fate of Eteocles and Polyneices. If Aeschylus disregarded earlier in the trilogy the full curse-form of the *Thebais* and made Oedipus pray only that his sons might divide their inheritance by the sword, not that they kill each other; also if a story was current, independent of the *Thebais*, in which they survived this battle, then considerable suspense might arise over this issue. But we cannot even hazard a guess on either of these points. There can hardly have been much intrinsic interest or suspense over the other pairs of combatants; their function is to lead up to the brother-duel, making this battle dignified and noble as well as terrible. To allow the brothers to seek each other out in the press and glut their mutual hatred with common disregard of the common weal would have offended Aeschylus' sense of order.

Hence the only means of suspense we can be sure of here is the development of the anticipation of a certain end.

3. *Phoenissae*.

In this curious play nearly all the elements of the Theban saga are introduced in one form or another, and we may discuss briefly each one in so far as it contributes to the general suspense.

a) Iocaste. By making her present at the attack of the Seven, Euripides goes back over Sophocles and Aeschylus to the *Thebais*.¹ Her inclusion, though justifiable dramatically, was partly motivated by Euripides' desire to present every important personage in the saga that could possibly be dragged into a single play; the same is true of Oedipus and Polyneices. Iocaste's usefulness appears throughout: 1) She is the obvious person to speak the prologue, having played a leading part in all the events since the exposure of Oedipus; 2) she is also the most convincing link possible between the two brothers if they are to be brought

¹ Cf. painting of Onasias *ap.* Paus. ix 4, 2. See Robert, p. 180.

together. Note 452–68, 528–85, her speeches to Eteocles and Polyneices. In 559 ff. she states well the futility of their joining battle, whatever the issue. Note also that in 469 ff. Polyneices' speech follows on his mother's; his demands are just and moderate (484–91), based on the former arrangement of alternating kingship¹ (473–80; 69–76), which appears here for the first time. In putting Polyneices in the right, Euripides follows Pherecydes and probably the *Thebais*, which was written from the Argive point of view (Powell, Intro. to *Phoenissae*, p. 61). Thus by introducing Iocaste and justifying Polyneices, Euripides fixes our sympathies and creates a livelier suspense as to the outcome of the meeting. Eteocles has to take refuge in sophistry (504–10) and pure self-will (510–20), so that the story may take its course; 3) there is a second attempt by Iocaste, probably quite new in this play, to prevent the conflict of the brothers at the last moment; to this end the angelia is made more elaborate and the proceedings divided into three stages, so as to be quite understandable. The third stage is the truce initiated by Eteocles' proclamation from the tower (1223 ff.), under cover of which Iocaste rushes out with Antigone (1264–82). Thus the suspense of the second angelia (1339, 1349) is highly complicated. Not only the success or failure of Iocaste's errand but her actual fate is clearly a question after 1282. Quite conceivably her death followed here in the *Thebais* (see Robert, p. 415), but whether or not the audience had this or another lead as to her fate we cannot say.

b) Form of the curse. As in the *Septem* only the first of the two *Thebais* curses is kept (67–8),

ἀρὰς ἀράται παισὶν ἀνοσιωτάτας
θηκτῷ σιδήρῳ δῶμα διαλαχεῖν τόδε.

So, except for the compulsion of the saga, the conclusion is not foregone. On the other hand, more is made of the abiding effect of the original oracle to Laius than in the *Septem* (19–20),

εἰ γὰρ τεκνώσεις παῖδ', ἀποκτενεῖ σ' ὁ φύς,
καὶ πᾶς σὸς οἶκος βῆσται δὶ αἴματος.

To this clearly refers 624 ἐρρέτω πρόπας δόμος, which is an answer to Iocaste's πατρὸς οὐ φεύξεσθ' Ἐρινῦς; Not only the father's curse,

¹ For another story of a contract, see Hellanicus *ap. schol. Phoen.* 71, and Robert, p. 271 with note 41.

but an older blight, is destroying us, a blight which affects the whole family. Note the suggestion of Iocaste's suicide and also her reference to Polyneices' marriage (341-3) as

ἀλαστρα ματρὶ τῷδε Λαῖω τε τῷ παλαιγενεῖ,
γάμων ἐπακτὸν ἄταν.

The word *ἀλαστρα* and the mention of Laius show that more is meant than that “a foreign wife is no blessing”. Clearly it was *ἄτη* to marry at all. This thought is pursued in the antistrophe (801 ff.). Would that Cithaeron had never taken up Oedipus! —814 ff.

οὐ γὰρ ὁ μὴ καλὸν οὕποτ' ἔφυ καλόν,
οὐδέ' οἱ μὴ νόμιμοι
παῖδες ματρὶ λόχευμα, μίασμα πατρός.

A curse lay on the boys from the manner of their birth, from which ill was bound to come;—867-9

νοσεῖ γὰρ ἥδε γῆ πάλαι, Κρέον,
ἔξ οὐ τεκνώθη Λάιος βίᾳ θεῶν,
πόσιν τ' ἔφυσε μητρὶ μέλεον Οἰδίπουν.

Yet, though the explicit death-curse is omitted, there is no doubt as to the coming death of the brothers. This is settled by Teiresias (880). This theme appears in the *Septem*, but too late to affect suspense (844, 902 ff.; cf. 748 *θνάσκοντα γέννας ἀτερ σώζειν πόλιν*, the counterpart of *Phoen.* 20-1). In the *Oedipus Tyrannus* the oracle states simply that any son Laius begets will kill him (713-4, 1176), and this was undoubtedly the original form of the prediction when the story of Laius and Oedipus was still personal and independent of the wars with Argos and the Minyaean. (See Robert, p. 62, 66-7, 119 ff.) Here, in an unavoidable issue, suspense is produced, not by trying to bring up alternatives, but by alluding constantly to the end which everyone knows is coming, and thus inducing a mood of nervous expectation. This need brings about the extension of the prophecy uttered to Laius over the fortunes of the whole house until the family is extinct.

c) Menoeceus. Robert (p. 416) following Wilamowitz (*De Eur. Heraclidis*; Pr. Greifswald, 1882) believes this episode to be a free invention of Euripides (so also Powell, Introduction to *Phoenissae*, p. 82, and Weeklein quoted there). His argument is “die dramatische Ökonomie der Phoinissen . . . allein den

Schlüssel für diese Erfindung gibt”, which amounts to saying that the episode as it appears in the play is decently motivated. The reference to a grave and legend of Menoeceus in Pausanias¹ (ix 25, 1), which diverges from Euripides, and the dance Μενοικέως ἀπώλεια in Luc. *de Salt.* 43 (surely a strange by-product of literature! Cf. Hdt. v, 67), constitute a certain presumption in favor of an independent legend.

The incident, however, as critics agree, is appropriate and effective. It is introduced (867–9) as a means to do away with the curse on the land due to Laius' disobedience and the resulting abominations. He goes on:

- 880 ἔγγυς δὲ θάνατος αὐτόχειρ αὐτοῖς, Κρέον.
 884 σύ τ', ὡ τάλαινα, συγκατασκάπτη πόλι,
 εἰ μὴ λόγοισι τοῖς ἐμοῖς τὶς πείσεται.

Then the halt (891). As in *Oedipus Tyrannus* he whets our curiosity by refusing to speak. The suspense here works backwards in a curious way. We know the city was saved, and here Teiresias makes this event depend on some intermediate step which his reticence shows to be disagreeable,—

- 892 πικρὸν τε τοῖσι τὴν τύχην κεκτημένοις.

In 905–7 he asks that Menoeceus be removed. The story was too obscure to be known to many of the audience, and our curiosity is not satisfied till 913 σφάξαι Μενοικέα. Objective suspense is now over, all around, and interest shifts to the means and details of accomplishment. The delay is complicated by Creon's appeal to Teiresias 919–29, followed by the reason for the sacrifice, 931–59 —Ares and Ge must be satisfied by the human blood of a Cadmeian. These details are clear, and in themselves not relevant to the story; very likely the legend was originally connected with some other early war.

d) Polyneices. He appears in person in order: 1) to give his side of the exposition, which includes an intimate statement of his feeling and point of view 389 ff.; 2) to make a reconciliation seem possible for a while; 3) to give the contrast of character

¹ Delphi, not Teiresias, is responsible for the sacrifice in Pausanias. Cf. *Phoen.*, lines 852–7, which almost certainly show that the “oracle” in the *Erechtheus* to sacrifice the maiden proceeded from Teiresias. How else could he have made the Cecropidae victorious? But the mythological source, which also mentions Euripides, says εἰς Δελφοὺς ἴων. Lycurgus *schol. Leoc.* 98; see Nauck *s.v. Erechtheus*. Cf. Stob. 39, 33; Paradox. 219 Westermann.

between himself, his mother, and his brother. The introduction of Polyneices into Thebes here is doubtless quite new with Euripides. The suggestion of such a visit lay already in the story of Tydeus' entry into Thebes:

τοὺς δ' ἄρ' ἐπ' Ἀσωπῷ λίπε χαλκοχίτωνας Ἀχαιούς,
αὐτὰρ ὁ μειλιχὸν μῆθον φέρε Καδμείοισιν
κεῖσ· ἀτὰρ ἂψ ἀπιών μάλα μέρμερα μήσατο ἔργα (*Il.* X, 287-9).

For the relation of this passage to the *Thebais* see Robert, p. 186 ff.

Like Polyneices in the *Phoenissae*, Tydeus brought a proposal for an agreement, was rejected, and on his return μάλα μέρμερα μήσατο ἔργα. Cf. *Phoen.* 625. Pol. ὡς τάχ' οὐκέθ' αἰματηρὸν τούμόν ἀργήσει ξίφος. There is no trace in the *Phoenissae* of the story of the athletic contest between Tydeus and the young Thebans (*Il.* IV, 806-7; VII, 385-90). But Polyneices' fear of an ambush 263-73, 361-6 seems meant to suggest the passage in *Il.* VII, 391-8. Polyneices fears the ambush as he enters the city; Tydeus fell into one on his return, presumably outside the walls. Robert (p. 193) compares the story, which appears only in pictures, of Achilles, Troilus, and Polyxena. See Roscher iii 2, 2723 ff. But in the *Phoenissae* the mention of an ambush at Polyneices' departure would have been a jarring note after the subtle psychological interests of the foregoing scene, and the play begins at a stage in the war when the besieged were tightly enclosed inside the citadel. Cf. the first part of the angelia 1090-1186, and the change 1190. An ambush story like that about Tydeus, the *Doloneia*, or, apparently, that about Troilus and Polyxena, implies a state of open warfare in which the besieged are encamped outside their gates. The Tydeus story would probably not occur to any of the audience, nor did it occur to anyone that Polyneices, since he was fated to fight with his brother, would fall into an ambush. He is brought in merely for the interest in the moral and pathetic side of his relations to his mother and brother.

e) Burial of Polyneices. The command to leave Polyneices unburied is put in the mouth of Eteocles (774-7); these are almost his last words, and hence emphatic (cf. Soph. *Ant.* 515). The suspense about this carries on through the angelia, where it is re-aroused by Polyneices' dying request for burial (1447 ff.).

Antigone announces her decision to bury her brother (1657), and Creon threatens her with death (1658). The suspense as to this is taken up into the quite novel theme which follows (1679 ff.): Antigone will follow her father into exile. She actually bullies Creon into agreeing to this by threatening to murder her bridegroom if she is forced to marry Creon's son (1673-5), so that he is only too glad to be rid of her (1682). There is no definite conclusion of the burial issue, but the impression we carry away is that Creon is cowed by 1673-5 and ready to let her out of the country on her own terms, which would naturally include the burial. The point Robert raises (p. 425), that the prohibition of Eteocles only refers to Theban earth, is hence different from the version of the *Antigone*, and, further, refers to the casting out of the bones of Phrynicus in 412 B.C. (*Lycurgus Leoc.* 113), is too subtle a distinction to have any value for suspense. Nor is there any essential difference between the various versions of Creon's proclamation, which is the definitive thing:

Ant. 26 ff. *τὸν δ' ἀθλίως θανόντα Πολυνέικους νέκυν
ἀστοῖσι φασιν ἐκκεκηρύχθαι τὸ μὴ
τάφω καλύψαι μηδὲ κωκῦσαι τινα,
ἔân δ' ἄκλαυτον, ἄταφον, οἰωνοῖς γλυκὺν
θησαυρόν.*

Ant. 203 ff. *τοῦτον πόλει τῇδ' ἐκκεκήρυκται τάφω
μήτε κτερίζειν μήτε κωκῦσαι τινα
ἔân δ' ἄθαπτον καὶ πρὸς οἰωνῶν δέμας
καὶ πρὸς κυνῶν ἐδεστὸν αἰκισθέντ' ἰδεῖν.*

Phoen. 1632 ff. *ὅς ἂν νεκρὸν τόνδ' ἡ καταστέφων ἀλῷ
ἢ γῆ καλύπτων, θάνατον ἀνταλλάξεται.*

The source of this incident lies, not in Phrynicus' bones, but in the *Antigone* of Sophocles. As to the fate of Antigone, previous stories gave no clear lead, as the matter was only taken up into the drama by Sophocles. Whether Euripides' *Antigone*, which flatly contradicted the Sophoclean issue,¹ preceded the *Phoenissae* or not, we do not know. But in an unfamiliar story like this, a dramatist was not bound by the arrangements of a predecessor, and Euripides cuts loose from both his own and the Sophoclean *Antigone* in 1673-8. As at the end of the *Oedipus Coloneus*, her future is simply left uncertain. This part of the play is so

¹ See Robert's convincing reconstruction, p. 381 ff.

crowded that the audience probably became confused from 1583 on. After 1588 and 1632-3 they would naturally expect to end with a summary of the *Antigone* of Sophocles. Lines 1673-5 shake them roughly out of this belief, and the answer comes in 1679, with her resolve to follow her father into exile, a criticism of Sophocles' *Oedipus Tyrannus*, as we saw. The burial issue is then dropped, and the suspense trails off rather lamely.

f) The future of Oedipus. As we saw above, both Euripides and Sophocles felt that in any dramatization of Oedipus' history subsequent to the blinding, Oedipus needed some companion. Here Antigone steps into the place of her mother (1549) as his protector (1679). His going forth is made necessary by the fact that Euripides wishes to account for the local Colonus legend (1707-9), which requires that he go forth from Thebes, and thus Antigone's accompanying him is a corollary of that. For the sources for the Colonus-story, see Robert, p. 18 ff., and for his ingenious theory as to its origin see p. 36 ff. That this story went beyond a legend vaguely associating Oedipus with the locality is improbable, for it appears from the *Oedipus Coloneus* that there was no visible grave or shrine. This is significant, for it suggests that the close of the *Oedipus Tyrannus*, implying the inevitable death of Oedipus, had been noticed and discussed in cultivated circles. Euripides had already contradicted this by keeping *Oedipus* shut up in Thebes through the war. Thus 1679 is to show that, in sending Oedipus into exile, Euripides is not leaving him to the fate of the *Oedipus Tyrannus* even at this time. The Colonus legend might naturally occur here to many of the audience, and keep up suspense till it was mentioned.

Thus from 1679 on, the arrangements which close the play and the history of the Labdacid house are in drama quite new. They have a patriotic interest parallel to that of the *Eumenides*, as sketching a history associating Attica with the final reconciliation of a foreign house long at enmity with the gods.

4. *Oedipus Coloneus.*

The suggestion for this play lay already at hand in the *Phoenissae* (Robert, p. 457) 1703 ff.

- | | |
|------|---|
| 1705 | <i>νῦν χρησμός, ὃ παῖ, Λοξίου περαινεται.</i> |
| | <i>ἐν ταῖς Ἀθήναις κατθανεῖν μ' ἀλώμενον.</i> |
| 1707 | <i>ιερὸς Κολωνὸς, δώματ' ιππίου θεοῦ.</i> |

What was the form of the legend that lay behind this, we cannot tell. Robert's ingenious theory (see Ch. 1 of his book) that it grew out of an apparition to one of the soldiers in a hypothetical battle with the Thebans in 506 B.C., an identification of this with Oedipus, and a *vaticinatio post eventum*, deserves attention, but there are many missing links in the evidence. However, most of what is vital to suspense in our play was put together out of the elements in the literary saga, or invented to supplement it.

a) The oracle. 1) Cf. *Phoen.* 1703–7 above. Sophocles uses this oracle to bind together the varied action of his play. The first intimation is in 44–5; he knows Colonus by the presence of a shrine to the Eumenides, and he intends to stay. He wishes (70) to send a message to the King, and states the meaning of the oracle (88–95). He is to end his life at a place which is evidently, by its description, the one where he now is. This sets the main suspense of the play as suspense of anticipation, not of uncertainty.

2) Another oracle appears in 1331–2:

εἰ γάρ τι πιστόν ἔστιν ἐκ χρηστηρίων,
οἷς ἀν σὺ προσθῇ, τοῖσδ' ἔφασκ' εἶναι κράτος.

This, curiously, appears first in the scene with Polyneices and causes a sham suspense of uncertainty as to the event of the Theban war, until it is clear that Oedipus will join neither side.

3) Also 409–11

ἔσται ποτ' ἄρα τοῦτο Καδμείοις βάρος . . .
τῆς σῆς ύπ' ὄργῆς, σοὶσι ὅταν στῶσιν τάφους.

These last two oracles were evidently delivered to the Thebans (possibly also the first, cf. 353–6), and made known to Oedipus only by accident. It is impossible to win any coherent view as to the occasions of these pronouncements. Oedipus speaks of a body of oracles delivered about him (353–5) and spoken at different times; in 87 they appear to have been delivered all at once. Of the three oracles, 1) was taken from *Phoen.* 1703–5; 2) was invented for this play, for there is nothing to indicate that in any previous story Oedipus was even potentially an arbiter in the quarrel between his sons, except as damning both; and 3) was presumably suggested by some element in the local legend (cf. the oracle in *schol.* to *O. C.* 57). Thus an element of patriotic expectation would go into the suspense which this

arouses. Beside this, it serves to motivate the scene with Creon, an action, that is, which tends against Oedipus' settlement here and thus makes a play. If we could suppose that Creon knew about the oracle (1332-3), it would serve as a further explanation of his conduct. But Ismene has the latest information from Thebes (387-90), and 1332-3 are doubtless meant for a separate oracle to Polyneices and his allies. It quickens suspense at the close of this scene and adds dignity to the conclusion, because it makes this an alternative to Oedipus' returning to Thebes and his home with full honors (1342). This causes a real suspense of uncertainty till 1100, when the children are rescued and it is clear that Oedipus will not go to Thebes. This oracle makes one think for a while that he will go, because we know the city was saved. But the oracle says "hard on the *Cadmeians*", not the Thebans in general, and this must be taken as referring to the reigning house. Robert (p. 469 ff.) believes the Polyneices scene to be an addition unessential to, and here contradicting, the rest of the play. But there is nothing to show that the two oracles are incompatible. Cf. 422-3.

ἐν δ' ἐμοὶ τέλος
αὐτοῖν γένοιτο τῆσδε τῆς μάχης πέρι.

1332-3 seem like a fulfilment of this. Did Sophocles think of that oracle as delivered *after* Oedipus had uttered those very words?

b) Oracle 2), as we saw, brought Oedipus into connection with the expedition of the Seven and so, conformably, the impending battle, which is perfectly familiar to the audience, is kept in the back of their minds. Preparations are described in 365-81, and continued in 1301-45. The progress extends to the action (1311-2); the invaders are already camped before Thebes. Parallel to this runs the development of the curse-theme: 1) 421-54; neither son will ever get any benefit from his mother city. This is changed from the simple curse of the earlier stories to a statement of something which Oedipus knows from the oracles (452-4); hence the strife is fated. 2) In 789 f. in answer to Creon, Oedipus says that both sons will get enough Theban land to die in (cf. *Sept.* 819 f.). 3) From 1372 ff. it appears that they will die at each other's hands; this is confirmed by 1383-8. This last prediction, made directly to Polyneices' face, is taken from the second curse of the *Thebais* and possibly from the Aeschylean

trilogy. But the disastrous results of the war are really a foregone conclusion from the beginning, and thus the curse is not the cause of it, although Polyneices, less documented with oracles, believes it so to be (1432–4).

The curse is thus in its form similar to the *Thebais*. 421–54 corresponds inexactly to fr. 2 Evelyn-White, and 1372–88 exactly to fr. 3. Only, the curse is not the cause, and this trait is new. The actual issue of the fight is left unconcluded though certain, and we are reminded of it once before the end (1769–70). It should be noted that the curse theme, and the suspense of anticipation it involves, run along independent of and parallel to, the suspense of uncertainty caused by the oracle in 409–11. They are confusing, but would contradict each other only in case Oedipus went to Thebes.

c) Robert (p. 8 ff.) sees in 389–407, 784–6 a reference to the legend and location of the original grave of Oedipus at Eteonus. Thus the play represents the conflict between two local legends. To Sophocles' mind this conflict was probably present, but the fact of the Eteonus cult was hardly well known to his audience, and the lines hence have no more than their face value. The theme of a Theban embassy trying to fetch back Oedipus for the sake of his grave, after he had gone on his wanderings, is unknown to previous literature so far as we know it. The determining factor in suspense here is the question whether Colonus will in fact be the place of Oedipus' death. Once Sophocles has raised this issue, we are keen to see it carried through and the Colonus story justified.

5. *Antigone*.

The suggestion of this play seems to come from two sources:

a) The Eleusinian story (Hdt. ix 27, 3; Aesch. *Eleusinioi ap.* Plut. *Thes.* 29: See Nauck.). According to this version, after the expedition of the Seven, the Thebans refused burial to their dead enemies, but the Athenians persuaded or compelled the Thebans to allow burial. The corpses were then buried at Eleusis or Eleutheræ; *ταφαὶ δὲ τῶν πολλῶν ἐν Ἐλευθεραῖς δείκνυνται, τῶν δ' ἡγεμόνων περὶ Ἐλευσῖνα*, Plutarch. Polyneices appears in Eur. *Suppl.* His name is mentioned last, and by Theseus¹

¹ The connection of this passage is curious. Does it mean that his body was not there?

(928 ff.). There is no allusion to Antigone. Creon figures in Eur. *Suppl.* through the mouth of his herald. But there was no question of a formal forbidding of burial, addressed to the Thebans, who might be presumed to stand together in this matter. There was no Antigone and no Haemon. This story contradicts the *Thebais*, in which the seven heroes, who did not include Adrastus, were burned in great state after the battle. (Pind. *N.* ix 24; vi 15 ff., and Asclepiades *ad loc.* in *schol.*)

b) Robert finds traces of a more personal story than this in the reference to Ion of Chios¹ in the Salustian hypothesis to the *Antigone*: ὁ μὲν γὰρ "Ιων ἐν τοῖς διθυράμβοις καταπρησθῆναι φησιν ἀμφοτέρας (i.e., Antigone and Ismene) ἐν τῷ ιερῷ τῆς "Ηρας ὑπὸ Λαοδάμαντος τοῦ Ἐτεοκλέους. This is supposed to be a punishment for something. A story can be traced back as far as Callimachus² to the effect that Antigone buried Polynices by dragging his body to the already burning pyre of his brother. The difficulty lies in connecting this story with the curious event in Ion, and precisely here, the evidence fails. Robert connects the two without hesitation and finds in the reference to the temple of Hera in Ion a trace of the temple legend that started the whole story. If that is the case, we have a curious phenomenon, *viz.*, two parallel legends appearing in literary form about the same time, dealing roughly with the same event but with the widest divergence of detail and consequences, and each story securing, moreover, a following amongst later writers. Nevertheless, there is much to be said in favor of this theory. The incident in Ion is otherwise hard to motivate, and the proposed inclusion of Ismene in Antigone's punishment (Robert, p. 364 ff.) seems like an echo of a story where both were equally guilty. Cf. *Ant.* 488 ff.; 534 ff.; 576 ff.; 779 ff. Robert compares also Polyneicees' appeal to *both* his sisters (*O. C.* 1407 ff.); also the tomb where Antigone was immured, with the burned temple of Hera. Cf. the Brazen House of Pausanias in Sparta (Thue. i 134). The inevitable conflation of a) and b) appears in Apollod. iii 7, 1.

If such a story was extant before Sophocles' *Antigone*, it would create a strong presumption in favor of the disastrous ending of the play. But it would give no lead as to the precise event, *viz.*,

¹ See Robert, p. 362 ff. for discussion: Ion's literary activity at Athens falls between B.C. 452-21.

² See Robert, vol. ii, p. 126, n. 53 for refs.

her hanging of herself. Note also that the suspense is kept up without any general recourse to foreknown saga. In 944 ff. Creon has shown no sign of relenting, and disaster will follow in the natural course. In 988, that certain harbinger of evil, Teiresias, appears and (1064 ff.) proclaims disaster: Creon will lose someone from his own family. Then Creon changes his mind (1095–1110). But now we know from Teiresias that the disaster is coming, and Creon's change of heart only adds to the dramatic irony, but causes no uncertainty. This sequence is only made possible by the fact that it takes Teiresias till 1064–71 to make Creon see what we, and even the chorus, saw in 762–7.

No traces of the romantic story of Haemon, nor of Eurydice, appear in earlier literature so far as we can trace it. Line 2 $\tau\hat{\omega}\nu \dot{\alpha}\pi' \Omega\delta\iota\pi\upsilon\kappa \kappa\kappa\hat{\omega}\nu$ is a general reference to the evils connected with the birth and history of Oedipus, and this theme is elaborated in an ode (583 ff.), but it finds no part in the dialogue, which is vividly human and bears little relation to anything outside itself.

The story in Ion may therefore be taken as creating suspense of anticipation of a disaster, while the precise nature of the disaster is clearly a matter of doubt owing to the shift of chronology, by which Eteocles is already buried. This is the same method we saw in the *Rhesus* and *Philoctetes*.

6. *Supplices.*

For the old story, which is probably that of the *Thebais*, see Pind. *O.* vi 15 and Asclepiades *ap. schol. ad loc.*; *N.* ix 22 ff. There is here no question of the Thebans refusing burial to their dead enemies. This story proceeded from Eleusis or Attica (Hdt. ix 27). Cf. Aeschylus and Philochorus *ap. Plut. Thes.* 29 (see Nauck², p. 18–9). There is no variant in its general course or issue, except for the version less discreditable to themselves, invented by the Thebans, according to which they gave up the bodies willingly instead of under compulsion (Paus. i 39, 2). There is no earlier reference for Euadne as daughter of Iphis and wife of Capaneus; hence one is free to believe that her self-sacrifice was quite new to the audience, and that there was no lead given by any previous story as to what she would do when she appeared (990). There is no trace of a self-sacrifice story other-

wise in the legends of the burial of the seven heroes. The fact that she is a sister of the shadow-figure, Eteocles, who appears first in *Sept.* 457, without parentage, and is here given a father by Euripides (1036-7), would go to show that she is, like him, only the creature of a dramatic emergency. Iphis has a small history of his own in later authors (see Roscher s.v.), but his connection with Eteocles seems to rest on this play. There is thus suspense of anticipation regarding the burial theme from the beginning and of uncertainty regarding Euadne from 980 to 1072.

IV. ATHENIAN LEGENDS.

1. *Medea.*

This play is drawn partly from an Athenian, partly from a Corinthian, source. How much of the story existed before Euripides it is impossible to say, for there is not one single trait of his play beyond the localization of Iason and Medea in Corinth for which uncontested earlier evidence exists. Without attempting an exhaustive review of the evidence, we may try to reach a point of view regarding each important incident.

a) Murder of the children. Did anything in the earlier saga lead the audience to expect this?

1) Pausanias, ii 3, 10, purporting to summarize Eumelus, a Corinthian epic poet of the last half of the eighth century, tells us that Medea hid her children in the temple of Hera, hoping to make them immortal; she was deceived of her hope and left Corinth; it is implied that her children died. But it appears from Paus. ii 1, 1, that he had no direct knowledge of Eumelus, but used a prose history¹ which he thought was by Eumelus: Εὔμηλος . . . ὃς καὶ τὰ ἔπη λέγεται ποιῆσαι, φησὶν ἐν τῷ Κορινθίᾳ συγγραφῆ, εἰ δὴ Εὐμήλου γε ἡ συγγραφή. . . . This history used Eumelus, at least in the genealogies; cf. Paus. ii 3, 10, with Eum. fr. 2 K. The scholiast to Pind. *O.* xiii 74, who had a text of Eumelus, supplements this story: ἐκεῖ (i.e., in Corinth) δὲ αὐτῆς (Medea) ὁ Ζεὺς ἡράσθη, οὐκ ἐπείθετο δὲ ἡ Μήδεια, τὸν τῆς "Ιπρας ἐκκλίνουσα χόλον" διὸ καὶ ἡ "Ιπρα ὑπέσχετο αὐτῇ ἀθανάτους ποιῆσαι

¹ See E. G. Wilisch, *Ueber die Fragmente des Epikers Eumelos*, Leipzig, 1875.

τοὺς παῖδας. ἀποθανόντας δὲ τούτους τιμῶσι Κορίνθιοι, καλοῦντες μιξοβαρβάρους. Much is lacking for a complete understanding of what happened, *e.g.*, why Hera went back on her promise, but there ought to be no doubt that these two passages come from the same source, *viz.*, Eumelus' *Corinthiaca*. (Cf. the Scholiast to Ap. Rh., i 146; iii 1372, who also had a text.) Thus we have clear earlier evidence for a story of an involuntary murder, as Seeliger rightly observes (Roscher *s.v. Medea*, col. 2493). This however was probably not connected with an action on Iason's part until Euripides, and would not figure in suspense until Medea mentions it (792), with a new motivation. This issue would then be certain, though the murder is here voluntary.

2) Medea, in lines 1378–83, proposes to bury her children in the precinct of Hera Akraia, where the Corinthians will perform *σεμνὴν ἔορτὴν καὶ τέλη*. To this passage may be traced *schol. Med.* 1379 and Zenodotus i 27, according to which Medea founded the cult of Hera Akraia. Pausanias saw in Corinth (ii 3, 6) the graves of Medea's children, at which propitiatory offerings had been made yearly until the Roman conquest: *οὐκέτι ἐκεῖναι καθεστήκασιν αὐτοῖς αἱ θυσίαι παρὰ τῶν ἐποίκων, οὐδὲ ἀποκείρονται σφισιν οἱ παῖδες, οὐδὲ μέλαιναν φοροῦσιν ἐσθῆτα* Paus., ii, 3, 7. With these offerings he connects a legend contradicting the Eumelus story, which he tells a few lines further on, to the effect that the Corinthians had stoned to death Medea's children in revenge for the murder of Glauce. Their own children then began to die, until, at the behest of an oracle, they established the sacrifices. Parmeniscus (*schol. Med.* 273) and Didymus (*schol. Med.* 273), quoting one Creophylus, presumably the historian of Ephesus, give two variants of this:

Parm.

τὰς δὲ Κορινθίας οὐ βουλομένας ὑπὸ βαρβάρου καὶ φαρμακίδος γυναικὸς ἄρχεσθαι, αὐτὴν τε ἐπιβουλεῦσαι καὶ τὰ τέκνα αὐτῆς ἀνελεῖν, ἐπτὰ μὲν ἄρρενα, ἐπτὰ δὲ θῆλεα. ταῦτα δὲ διωκόμενα καταφυγεῖν εἰς τὸ τῆς ἀκραίας "Ἴρας" ιερὸν καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ ιερὸν καθίσαι, Κορινθίους δὲ αὐτῶν οἱδὲ οὕτως ἀπέχεσθαι ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τοῦ βωμὸν πάντα ταῦτα ἀποσφάξαι. λοιμοῦ δὲ γενομένου εἰς τὴν πόλιν πολλὰ σώματα ὑπὸ τῆς νόσου διαφθείρεσθαι, μαντευομένοις δὲ αὐτοῖς χρησμῷδῆσαι τὸν θεὸν ἰλάσκεσθαι τὸ τῆς Μήδειας τέκνων ἄγος. ὅθεν Κορινθίους μέχρι τῶν καιρῶν τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς καθ' ἔκαστον ἐνιαυτὸν ἐπτὰ κούρους καὶ ἐπτὰ κούρας τῶν ἐπισημοτάτων ἀνδρῶν ἐναπενιαυτίζειν τῷ τῆς θεᾶς τεμένει, καὶ μετὰ θυσιῶν ἰλάσκεσθαι τὴν ἐκείνων μῆνιν καὶ τὴν δὲ ἐκείνους γενομένην τῆς θεᾶς ὄργήν.

In the *schol.* to *Med.* 10 Parmeniseus is credited with the story that Euripides received five talents for shifting the blame of the murder from the Corinthians to Medea.

Clearly the same base underlies Paus. ii 3, 6 and the two quotations in the seholium to *Med.* 273. Of these versions, that of Creophylus motivates the murder of the children through the murder of Creon by Medea; that of Pausanias with the murder of Glaucc.¹ Both these incidents are themselves unmotivated in the context and the inference is that they were borrowed from Euripides. The story of Parmeniseus, however, shows no trace of Euripidean influence. The act of the Corinthians is motivated simply by their irritation at Medea, whom they felt to be a

Creoph. ap. Did.

τὴν γὰρ Μήδειαν λέγει διατρίβουσαν ἐν Κορίνθῳ τὸν ἄρχοντα τότε τῆς πόλεως Κρέοντα ἀποκτεῖναι φαρμάκοις. δείσασαν δὲ τοὺς φίλους καὶ τοὺς συγγενεῖς αὐτοῦ, φυγεῖν εἰς Ἀθήνας, τοὺς δὲ νιούς, ἐπεὶ νεώτεροι ὄντες οὐκ ἥδυναντο ἀκολουθεῖν, καθιεῖν ἐπὶ τὸν βωμὸν τῆς ἀκραίας "Ἴρας", νομίσασαν τὸν πατέρα αὐτῶν φροντεῖν τῆς σωτηρίας αὐτῶν. τοὺς δὲ Κρέοντος οἰκείους ἀποκτείναντας αὐτοὺς διαδοῦναι λόγους ὅτι ἡ Μήδεια οὐ μόνον τὸν Κρέοντα ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς ἑαυτῆς παῖδας ἀπέκτεινε.

¹ Her name is not in the text of Eur. *Med.* but is associated later with Euripides' story. *Schol. Med.* 19; *Hyg. Fab.* 25.

barbarian. As in the other versions, the murder is connected closely with the fact of the cult and with the puzzling detail of the seven youths and the seven maidens. On this ground Seeliger (Rosch. s.v. *Medea*; col. 2494) says that the seven youths and seven maidens have nothing to do with the children of Medea—quite wrongly, as I believe.

The key to these passages lies in the end of the *schol.* Pind. O. xiii 74 quoted above, ἀποθανόντας δὲ τούτους τιμᾶσι Κορίνθιοι, καλοῦντες μιξοβαρβάρους. Here the sacrifices appear in connection with a story that made no one responsible for the death of the children. Now the word *μιξοβαρβάρους* obviously comes from the *formulae* of the cult itself. Hence the word may be, and very likely is, older than any story we have. Thus the story in Parmeniscus appears as a legend composed to account for a particular ceremony, and the first part is an explanation of the cult-word. It is not likely that this tale arose later than the Euripidean play, which fixed the dominant tradition and even took the cult into account. Thus we are left with the conclusion that the two stories: 1) that of the unwitting murder; and 2) that of a murder by the Corinthians, both preceded Euripides. The five-talent story is thus a malicious allusion to the fact that Euripides swept the older stories out of currency. That either of these stories was known to many of the audience is very doubtful, and therefore, so far as the children went, Euripides was virtually working new material. To anyone, however, who knew the story of the stoning, 792–3 would have a new significance. The employment of the children in the murder of Creon's daughter would make him think that the stoning-story would follow as a result of Creon's anger. Thus Medea's purpose to kill them needs to be expressed here to forestall the expectation of this. This purpose was not likely to fall through unless her whole plan failed, and the audience knew from the Athenian legend that it did not fail. Hence in any case from 792 on the suspense as to the fate of the children is purely that of anticipation.

b) The murder of Creon and his daughter. There is nothing that I can find in previous stories about this, nor about the second marriage of Iason. The only suggestions of a clash between Iason and Medea lie in the feeling of the Corinthians against a barbarian woman and her children, which might easily be carried over to her husband; and in the stories of her going to

Athens, or back to Asia. The suspense as to the marriage and the murder is developed entirely out of the lines of the play.

c) Medea and Athens. That a previous legend existed connecting Medea with Athens we can hardly doubt, in view of the unrelated appearance of Aegeus in this play, criticized in Ar. *Poet.* 61 b 19; cf. 54 b 1. A strong, though not conclusive, piece of evidence for such a legend is Hdt. vii 62, 1, ἀπικομένης Μηδείης τῆς Κολχίδος ἐξ Ἀθηνέων ἐς τοὺς Ἀρίους. For the details of this we are dependent on Euripides' *Aegeus*.¹ Wilamowitz (*Herm.* xv 1880, 482) believes this to have preceded the *Medea*; certainly, if that was true, it would have made the appearance of Aegeus in *Medea* seem less violent, and directed our minds before line 663 to this conclusion; but there is no evidence for this. In any case the existence of an Athenian legend would give the audience a clue to Medea's method of escape.

Euripides' play is throughout one of character, and the suspense as to particular events is little influenced by outside stories except in so far as they allowed a presumption that, whatever else happened, Medea herself would escape. (For the play of Neophron, see Christ, *Gr. Littgesch.* i 357–8. I find it impossible to believe that the fragments of this work antedated the *Medea*.)

2. *Hippolytus*.

This was written partly as an *apologia* (Arg. Eur. *Hip.*) for an earlier play on the same subject, and hence the variations of the myth that affect us will be variations from the earlier version. It seems pretty clear that in the earlier play Phaedra made her addresses to Hippolytus directly.² Phaedra also calls upon the moon (*Schol. Theoc.*, ii 10), not necessarily in magic rites. She also blames Theseus for his previous misdeeds (Plut., *De aud. poet.*, p. 28 A). Two passages in Apollod. Sabbait., p. 180, line 9 ff., σχίσασα τὰς τοῦ θαλάμου θύρας καὶ τὰς ἑσθῆτας σπαράξασα κατεψένσατο Ἰππολύτου βίαν, and line 24, γενομένου δὲ τοῦ ἔρωτος περιφανοῦς ἑαυτὴν ἀνήρτησε Φαιδρα, are referred by Wagner with some probability to this play. On the other hand, it is going

¹ Frr. ap. Nauck; cf. *schol.* *Med.* 167. The story in *schol.* to *Il.* XI, 741 is probably an hypothesis of the *Aegeus*.

² Hyp. Eur. *Hip.*, p. 5, ἀπρεπές καὶ κατηγορίας ἄξιον. Ar. *Ran.* 1043 ἀλλ' οὐ μᾶς Διῖς οὐ Φαιδρας ἐποίουν πόρνας. Cf. frr. 435–6 N. This trait appears also in Seneca's *Phaedra*.

too far to suppose that Theseus was absent in the underworld during the greater part of the play, or that this was the third member in a trilogy of matter, preceeded by the *Aegeus* and *Theseus* (Wilamowitz, *Intr. to Hipp.* 1891).

The earlier play will thus have been coarser in its lines. (See A. Kalkmann, *Quaestiones Novae de Euripidis Hippolyto*, p. 24 ff.) Phaedra presumably announces her intentions when she addresses the moon; the center of the play will contain her attempt to persuade Hippolytus. The suspense of this is split up in the extant play: 198–352 Phaedra declares herself; 401–2 she resolves to die; 435 ff. the nurse proposes a remedy for disease (479); this is explained in 491 and meets with violent opposition from Phaedra; in 524 ff. we are uncertain as to what the nurse will do; in 600 ff. we are uncertain whether Hippolytus will be won over; in 680 the suspense reverts to Phaedra's proposal to die. (With 401–2 cf. 599–600.) There is no suspense springing from variants, because the fundamental data of the love-story were constant and came down from the cult-song (1428–30). For the origin of this and the cult of Hippolytus at Troezen and Athens, see Wilamowitz, *Intr. to Hipp.*, p. 30 ff.

There is, however, an important variant at the end of the play in lines 1462–6:

κοινὸν τόδ' ἄχος πᾶσι πολίταις
ἡλθεν ἀέλπτως.
πολλῶν δακρύων ἔσται πίτυλος·
τῶν γὰρ μεγάλων ἀξιοπενθεῖς
φῆμαι μᾶλλον κατέχουσιν.

Fortunately Stobaeus preserves the corresponding bit from the *Hippolytus Veiled* (Fr. 446 N.):

ῳ μάκαρ, οἴας ἔλαχες τίμας,
'Ιππόλυτ' ἥρως, διὰ σωφροσύνην·
οὐποτε θυητοῖς
ἀρετῆς ἄλλη δύναμις μείζων·
ἡλθε γὰρ ἡ πρόσθ' ἡ μετόπισθεν
τῆς εὐσεβίας χάρις ἐσθλή.

This latter must refer to some more substantial benefit than the hero-cult promised by Artemis in ll. 1423–30. Cf. *Carmen Naupactium* Fr. 11 K. 'Ιππόλυτον (ἀνέστησεν ὁ Ἀσκλήπιος), ὡς ὁ τὰ Ναυπακτικὰ συγγράψας λέγει. Paus. ii 27, 4, ταῦτης τῆς στήλης

τῷ ἐπιγράμματι (record of twenty horses dedicated to Asclepius by Hippolytus on a stele in the precinct of Asclepius at Epidaurus) ὁμολογοῦντα λέγουσιν Ἀρικεῖς ὡς τεθνεῶτα Ἰππόλυτον ἐκ τῶν Οησέως ἀρῶν ἀνέστησεν Ἀσκλήπιος. A version which fits better to the end of a play and does not mention Asclepius is Paus. ii 32, 1. ἀποθανεῖν δὲ αὐτὸν οὐκ ἔθελουσι συρέντα ὑπὸ τῶν ἵππων οὐδὲ τὸν τάφον ἀποφαίνοντιν εἰδότες. τὸν δὲ ἐν οὐράνῳ καλούμενον ἥνιοχον, τοῦτον εἶναι νομίζοντιν ἐκεῖνον Ἰππόλυτον, τιμὴν παρὰ θεῶν ταύτην ἔχοντα. Pausanias does not make it clear how this story fitted with the grave of Hippolytus near his precinct at Troezen. Scarcely anyone will doubt that this, if it does not refer to the end of the *Hippolytus Veiled*, at least refers to the legend there preserved. Wilamowitz (Intr. to *Hipp.*, p. 43 ff.) believes that Asclepius restored Hippolytus to a superhuman life. This, however, will be a Troezenian cult legend and probably not include Asclepius. Asclepius, if he appeared at all, would restore only to life on earth, as appears in the Epidaurian story of the dedication of twenty horses. It is curious, however, that this Epidaurian version of a Troezenian legend should turn up in the *Ναυπάκτια*. Cf. Paus. x 38, 11, on the *provenance* of this epic. For the translation to stars, cf. Eur. *Or.* 1636–7; *Hec.* 1265–7; also the Hyades and Coronides discussed above in connection with *Iph. Aul.*

A consequence of this would be that there was no death-scene on the stage; it would be too much to ask of an audience to believe that a visible corpse was later to become a constellation. The place of the death-scene would be taken by a long speech from some divinity.

This bears on our play. If there were two earlier legends of Hippolytus' recovery, one of which was certainly known to the greater part of the audience through the *Hippolytus Veiled*, the presumption would be that here too he would be rescued in some miraculous way, at the last moment. This accounts for the unusual way in which Artemis behaves. After Artemis has explained the situation to Theseus, we expect that she will announce Hippolytus' translation and that the play will end. But instead she explains her inability to interfere, 1328–34. Then Hippolytus is brought in dying, and the converse he enjoys with Artemis is a faint shadow of the blessings given to the deified Hippolytus of the old Troezenian story.

Here mythological suspense appears at its highest, because it

sets us definitely on a false scent from the moment Hippolytus' disaster is announced.

3. *Ion*.

There is an indication in the *Ion* that an old Attic legend was being followed in the details as to localities, 11-3, 17; but information as to the sources of this plot is entirely lacking. Of the two Sophoclean plays that may deal with this theme, the *Ion* and the *Creusa*, the first has no fragments, and those of the second offer nothing. The evidence as to the Ion-saga, together with an attempt to account for the elements of this play, is well put together by E. Ermatinger, *Attische Autochthonensage*; Thesis, Zurich 1897, pp. 112-42.

One observation should be made, namely, that *Ion* here is a young man, and later became eponymous hero of a race (Hdt. v 66; vii 94; viii 44; Eur. *Ion* 74-5). Therefore it is a foregone conclusion that nothing serious can happen to him, even if both Creusa and Xuthus go to the ground. In an Attic legend, this means that suspense tends from 971 to discount the effectiveness of Creusa's plotting and go beyond it to its recoil on herself.

V. LEGENDS OF HERACLES.

1. *Heracles*.

Here as in the case of the Oedipus plays, the groundwork has been laid for an understanding of the myth (Wilamowitz, Introduction to *Heracles*). The story of Heracles' murder of his children is, according to Wilamowitz (Intr. 1² 86-8), in the Theban story a reason for his later absence from Thebes and his association with Argos, which could not be done away. There is no allusion in the *Iliad* or *Odyssey* to the child-murder; the Cypria (Proel.) mention the madness of Heracles, presumably this event; Stesichorus and Panyasis (Paus. ix 11) dealt with the event; how, we do not know; Pausanias (*l.c.*) gives the legend as current in his own day. Heracles killed his children in a fit of madness and was about to kill Amphitryon when Athena appeared (cf. Eur. *Her.* 1001-9) and stunned him with a huge stone. Pherecydes (fr. 30) relates that Heracles threw his children into a fire (cf. *Apollod.* 2, 4, 12, 1), and an illustration of this appears in a vase-

painting by Assteas of Paestum in Alexander's time (Roscher *s.v.* Megara, for picture; Wilam., *l.c.*, p. 85). Pindar *I.* iv 63–4 diverges from, or, as Wilamowitz thinks (*l.c.*, 82–3) directly polemicizes against, this version in speaking of

χαλκοαράν ὄκτω θαυμόντων
τοὺς Μεγάρα τέκε οἱ Κρειοντὶς νιόύς,

without saying that their father killed them.

This is the substance of the evidence for an earlier handling.

The first half of the play seems a pure invention by Euripides. Lyceus is, in this connection, unparalleled (lines 26–31; Wilam., *l.c.*, p. 112). This part of the play is a variation of the suppliant-theme, which could be introduced anywhere; cf. the *Andromache*, which is similarly padded at the beginning. Dieterich (*Pulcinella*, p. 9 ff.) points out striking parallels between the structure of *Herac.* 1–522 and *Andr.* 1–543. The suppliant-theme in extant plays implies a deliverer,¹ and thus the presumption is that someone, obviously Heracles, will appear. At the beginning of the play the hero is in Hades, 25 ἐνθεν οὐχ ἥξει πάλιν. This is no presumption against his appearing, because it is said 22–3 that this is the last of the twelve labors, which we know were completed. Another resurrection was handled in Soph. *Phaedra* (fr. 624–5); possibly in Eur. *Hipp. Veiled*.

Lyceus orders servants to build a pyre to burn the children, 240–6. This is clearly a reference to another existing story, that the children were burned by Heracles (cf. Wilam.; *l.c.*, p. 85). Here the pyre is to be reasonably built of firewood. In the Assteas vase, it consists of household furniture. Hence it quickens suspense to bring the present play into connection with stories of the madness of Heracles, which has so far not been mentioned.

The most important innovation is the introduction of Theseus (Wilam., *l.c.*, p. 109–12). Suspense is perhaps at its keenest at the end of the scene with Amphitryon, where Heracles is contemplating suicide (1146 ff.). In 1151–2 he ends his review of possible deaths by σάρκα τὴν ἔμηνεν + ἔμπρήσας πυρί, a reference to the fire-death on Mt. Oeta which, like 240–6, quickens suspense by alignment with a known saga. Theseus does not broach his suggestion that Heracles go to Athens until 1322 ff.

¹ Cf. Aesch. *Suppl.*, where the deliverance is contradicted in the next play.

That this suggestion is to be followed, we are at once informed by 1328–9 *πανταχοῦ δέ μοι χθονὸς | τεμένη δέδασται.*¹ These precincts existed and were called after Heracles, as we know. If their existence is made conditional on Heracles' going, then obviously he will have to go.

The end of Heracles' life is thus made similar to that of Oedipus. That there was no legend already in Attica about this end of Heracles, no one would be so rash as to assert. On the contrary, it may be objected that Heracles is localized in no particular spot. 1216–7:

οὐδεὶς σκότος γὰρ ὁδὸς ἔχει μέλαν νέφος,
ὅστις κακῶν σῶν συμφορὰν κρύψειεν ἄν,

and 1231–2:

Ηρ. τί δῆτά μου κρᾶτ' ἀνεκάλυψας ἡλίω;
Θη. τί δ'; οὐ μιάνεις θνητὸς ὥν τὰ τῶν θεῶν,

are a flat contradiction of the ideas expressed by Creon in *Oed. Tyr.* 1424–8, and may well be a conscious criticism of that version of the Oedipus legend which enclosed the blinded old man in the house.

In 1406–8 Heracles' desire to embrace the corpses of his children, whom he has murdered, seems a transference from *Oed. Tyr.* 1521–2. Cf. *Her.* 1414 ὁ κλεινὸς 'Ηρακλῆς, with *Oed. Tyr.* 1524–5 Οἰδίποις ὅδε / ὅς τὰ κλειν' αἰνίγματ' ἤδει, and *Oed. Tyr.* 8 ὁ πᾶσι κλεινὸς Οἰδίποις καλούμενος. Note also *Her.* 1402 δίδον δέρη σὴν χεῖρ', δόληγήσω δ' ἔγώ. There is no specific mention, but in the exodus of the *Oed. Tyr.* Oedipus is evidently led by Creon 1515, 1521. On the whole, the exodus of the *Heracles* seems written with that of the *Oedipus Tyrannus* in mind; note the broken lines *Her.* 1418–2; *Oed. Tyr.* 1516–22. It is not unlikely that Euripides had already heard of the Colonus story of Oedipus (*Phoen.* 1703 ff.) and invented a similar one for Heracles. The interest in the embracing of the children is pathetic and does not stimulate suspense. But the parallel to the final fortunes of Oedipus suggests that this is an imitation of the *Oedipus Tyrannus* exodus, with an echo of the Colonus story. But the Colonus story had not yet figured in tragedy, unless this play followed the *Phoenissae*, which is unlikely. The theme of Hera-

¹ Cf. Wilamowitz, p. 110, for the transference of the precincts from Theseus to Heracles.

cles' removal to Athens had already been secured by the mention of the precincts (1328), before the embracing of the children is spoken of, and therefore the suspense from this source is *nil*.

To sum up the results for mythological suspense, there is no reason to believe that the audience expected anything but the deliverance by Heracles of the harassed family, until 822. Up to this point the suspense of anticipation rests, as we saw, on the familiar sequence of the suppliant motive: sanctuary, violence, rescue.

At 822 Iris and Lyssa appear, to create suspense of anticipation, through the murder. The children are to be killed (835); how, is not said. Knowing that Lycus has built a pyre, the audience will suppose, until the angelia, that Heracles will throw the children upon it.

2. *Trachiniae.*

There is no detailed earlier reference to the content of this play, and until the later sources have been more fully analyzed, it is impossible to form much of an idea as to the nature of what Sophocles and his audience had to go by. (So Wilamowitz, p. 71 ff.) The principal question is whether in any earlier version the marriage with Deianeira and the Nessus poison were associated with the fiery death on Mt. Oeta. If that was the case, the audience's mind would travel directly to the end of the play from 555 ff., or perhaps from the mention of Iole in 476 ff. The Nessus¹ story must have been familiar to many, and the audience can actually jump from 555 ff. through 1173. This, however, was certainly an old independent version of the death of Heracles. So likewise was the burning on Mt. Oeta, and different versions of that appear (Soph. *Phil.* 670, 802, 1432; Apollod. ii 7, 7, 11; Tzet. on Lyc. 50). Whether or not the conflation of the two that appears here, and, with still another addition, in Apollod. *l.c.*, is older than this play, is simply a *non liquet*.

Similarly, if the capture of Oechalia² had been previously associated with the Nessus shirt and a jealousy theme in which Iole figured, we should suspect from 74-5 the course the story would

¹ The earliest source is Archilochus in *schol.* to Ap. Rh., i 1212. For later references see Roscher *s.v.* *Nessus*.

² We know from the epigram in Strabo xiv, 1, 18 that this in Creophylus' version contained the story of Iole; see Kinkel, p. 60.

take. Fahlnberg¹ sees in Hyllus' steadfast refusal to light the fire, that only breaks down (1249) under a conditional curse (1239–40), an allusion to the story that Poeas or Philoctetes lit the pyre (*Soph. Phil.* 802, etc.). However, it is inevitable from 1195–9 that Heracles will be burned, and who touches him off does not much matter.

3. *Alcestis*.

For the *Alcestis*, as for the *Trachiniae*, no earlier story exists that amounts to anything. Reconstructions are therefore theoretical and too uncertain to serve us as data. The evidence is presented, mixed with a good deal of speculation, by L. Bloch, *Neue Jahrb. f. d. Kl. Alt.*, 1901, 40 ff., 113 ff. See also in Wilamowitz, *Isyllos*, p. 65 ff., an attempt to trace the story of Alcesteis to Hesiod's *Eoiae*; the evidence is very scanty. Compare Robert, *Thanatos*, p. 25 ff. It seems probable that the story was a whole and did not vary in its main lines throughout its history (so Bloch, *l.c.*): Alcesteis dies in place of her husband and is won back from death or Hades by a hero. The question whether she was won back by force or persuasion (see Bloch, p. 41, n. 1) does not here affect suspense, as it is a matter of angelia after the event.

The only reference with any bearing on the story is Servius to *Aen.* iv 694, “*alii dicunt Euripidem Orcum in scenam inducere gladium ferentem quo crinem Alcesti abscindat; Euripidem hoc a Phryniccho* (O. Jahn for *poenia* F., *phenico* T.) *antiquo tragico mutuatum.*”

4. *Heracleidae*.

Three points in the *Heracleidae* demand attention:

1) The sacrifice of Macaria. There is no earlier story of a willing sacrifice in connection with this plot. Macaria herself appears as present at the death of Heracles (*Duris Sam. ap. schol.* *Plat. Hipp. Mai.*, p. 293 A), but this need be no more than a conflation of Euripides with some story which mentioned Heracles' children as present at his death upon a pyre. For the willing sacrifice theme, see the discussion above under *Iph. Aul.* The issue of the play itself was a foregone conclusion to every

¹ The early references to the story of the *Trachiniae* are well presented by A. Fahlnberg, *De Hercule Tragico Graecorum*, p. 10 ff. See also Jebb's Intr. to *Trachiniae*.

Athenian, and therefore after 403-9 it was certain that someone would have to be sacrificed; similarly after 502, that it will be Macaria.

2) The rescuing of the Heracleidae from Eurystheus was told in Hdt. ix 26-7, together with the expedition of the Argive suppliants. Compare Ar. *Plut.* 385 and *schol.* for a painting by Pamphilus, which must have been familiar to the audience then; also Thuc. i 9; Isoc. *Pan.*, p. 51; Plut. *de Mal. Hdt.*, p. 872a; Aristides *Panath.*, p. 201. The story was common amongst panegyrists of the fourth century, and there could be no doubt of the issue. The incident of Macaria is thus introduced to add interest. The mythological suspense, so far as it occurs, is purely that of anticipation.

3) The Aristeia of Iolaus and the fate of Eurystheus. Iolaus was famous in the Theban legend as the great charioteer of Heracles. (Hesiod *Scut.* 74 ff.; Archil. fr. 118 B²; Pind. *I.* i 16; v 32; vii 9; *P.* xi, 60.) He also killed Eurystheus (*P.* ix 79). On the other hand, he had a tomb at Eleusis (*O.* ix 98) with a legend attached. Whether or not he appeared as an old man in the pre-Euripidean story, it is hard to tell. Pindar (*P.* xi 79) mentions him simply as a hero,¹ but this is a different legend from ours, for there he is buried beside Amphitryon. The death of Eurystheus, in some way or other, was an inevitable part of the Athenian legend, for his grave existed on the battlefield (Paus. i 44, 10). Here it is postponed, in order to include the address 1026 ff., which bears on current events.

The compulsion of the saga is clearly seen from 966 to the end. Both Herodotus (*l.c.*) and Thucydides (*l.c.*) agree that Eurystheus was killed. Euripides brings him into the play, partly from interest, partly from the lack of other great characters, and then is embarrassed by the question of what to do with him. The saga said, "Kill him," but this was not a sporting thing to do, and was repugnant to his patriotic Athenian feeling. So the responsibility for the death is "put up" to Alemene and to her alone. There is keen suspense as to whether he will be killed or not, from 958 to the end of what we have of the play.

¹ The version in the scholium, that he rose from the dead on this occasion, is probably only an elaboration of the Euripidean metamorphosis.

VI. MISCELLANEOUS.

1. *Bacchae.*

The myth of Pentheus was well fixed in its main outlines by Aeschylus' *Pentheus*. ή δὲ μυθοποῖα κεῖται παρ' Λισχύλῳ ἐν Πενθεῖ. Ar. Byz. in *Arg.* to *Bacchae*. The play will here be considered in relation to the Athenian audience (cf. *Schol. Ar. Ran.* 64). It may have been originally brought out in Macedonia. See H. Weil *Études*, p. 110. Aeschylus' *Xantriae* may have also dealt with the same story (*Schol. Eum.* 26; see Nauck², s.v., p. 55). It is also one of the few tragic stories for which we have a vase-painting of the severe type (Hartwig *Jahrb. Arch. Inst.* vii, p. 157; Taf. 5. Picture in Roscher iii 2, 1931–2). Pentheus (named) is being torn to pieces by two female figures, one of whom is labeled ΛΑΙΕΜΕ. The completeness of the tearing—all the lower part of his body is gone—and the few Maenads actually engaged in pulling at the remains, suggest that the artist or his predecessor had in mind a version like that of *Bac.* 1127–8:

ἀνεσπάραξεν ὁμον, οὐχ ὑπὸ σθένους
ἀλλ' ὁ θεός εὑμαρείαν ἐπεδίδον χεροῖν.

Hartwig (*l.c.*) supposes that in this version Pentheus was torn in pieces by Maenads accompanying Dionysus, not by his own mother and aunts. Cf. Aesch. *Eum.* 25–6:

ἔξ οὗτε βάκχαις ἐστρατήγησεν θεός
λάγω δίκην Πενθεῖ καταρράψας μόρον.

In the *Xantriae* Erinyes seem to have been present:

ἄς οὕτε πέμφιξ ἡλίου προσδέρκεται
οὕτ' ἀστερωπὸν ὅμμα Λητώς κόρης.

Cf. *P. V.* 796 (the Phorcides); *Eum.* 71–2. Compare with this the two late Italian vase-paintings, representing an Eriny (Bull. *Nap.* iv, tav. 2, 3: Dilthey, *Arch. Zeit.*, 31, taf. 7, 3). Nonnus (*Dionys.* 44–6) represents Dionysus as calling to his aid Lyssa, Mene, and Oestrus, but only to drive insane Pentheus, his mother and his aunts. The murder is performed by Agaue. In one of the Fury vases (Bull. *Nap.*, *l.c.*) this creature (here I have only the description in Roscher) stands over Pentheus while a Maenad attacks him; this might fit with the Nonnus story. But in the other (Dilthey) she conducts the attack herself, with a panther. On both these vases she is dressed in hunting costume. Compare the language of Aesch. *Eum.* 25–6.

Thus we seem to have these possibilities:

- 1) Pentheus was killed by Maenads (Attic vase 6–5 cent.);
- 2) Pentheus was killed by Agaue, etc. (Euripides and later literature generally);
- 3) Pentheus was killed by a Huntress Fury (?) (vase ap. Dilthey). Aesch. *Eum.* 25–6 seems to have followed the first version, and in none of the vases, so far as I can find, are the Maenads named. In support of the second possibility, a fury seems to be mentioned in *Xantriae* (Fr. 170 N.)

However, it is very unlikely that in neither the *Xantriae* nor the *Pentheus* was the murder committed by Agaue. The divergence is far too important to be overlooked by Aristophanes of Byzantium even in a brief note (v. *supr.*), and the *Bacchae* appears throughout to be an echo of an Aeschylean crime and punishment cycle; cf. *Bac.* 25 ff. If the Semele occurred in the same trilogy, as is likely (Welcker, *Aesch. Tril.* 327 ff.; Sandys *Intr. Bacch.* xxvi ff.) the *hybris* of Semele's sisters would occur there and be punished later. Thus, again, if the murder of Pentheus was a punishment for Agaue as well as for the murdered man, an *anagnorisis* must follow as in *Bac.* 1277 ff. This is the only issue beside the murder that calls forth objective suspense. The death of Pentheus is quite certain; the legend cannot exist without it. For the *anagnorisis*, as we see, an earlier parallel is likely.

Euripides appears to play upon the uncertainty as to who actually will murder Pentheus. In 32 Dionysus mentions Agaue and her sisters as roaming mad through the mountains. But compare 52—in the event of trouble, *ξυνάψω μανάσι στρατηλατεῖν*—an echo of the very language of *Eum.* 25–6. The economy of the play makes it increasingly clear that Pentheus will be murdered by his relatives, as is in fact inevitable. The real Bacchanals are the chorus; such a scene could not be enacted on the stage, and that the chorus should leave to do it is almost as unthinkable. When Pentheus (810 ff.) is persuaded to go and seek out the mad women on the mountain the issue can no longer be in doubt.

There is thus suspense of uncertainty rising from the double tradition, as to who will actually kill Pentheus, and this is gradually cleared away by the lines themselves.

2. *Supplices* (Aeschylus).

Reconstructions of previous versions are based mainly on this play. (See Wilam. *Interp.*, p. 12 ff.)

The suppliant-theme presupposed, as was noted under Eur. *Andr.* (cf. Dieterich, *l.c.*), a rescuer. Thus in this play there has to be a rescuer to complete the motive, although this ran counter to the saga, which is resumed in the succeeding play of the trilogy, where the Danaids, in some way, fall into the hands of the Aegyptids. If we accept this as a pre-existing tradition, the suppliancy of the Danaids and their reception by a Pelasgic king runs counter to the legend. It was probably inserted here simply to make a play. Thus the compulsion of the saga and the compulsion of religious feeling (later developed, as we saw, into a stock dramatic motive), contradict each other, and this issue doubtless caused lively suspense of uncertainty through 965. The compromise is effected by giving the play to the suppliant motive and the trilogy to the saga. Notice the title of this play and the vague name of the rescuer king, merely a lay figure with no footing in the legend; cf. Euadne in Eur. *Sup.* and Macaria in the *Heracleidae*.

3. *Prometheus*.

What suspense there is in this play depends almost entirely upon allusions to already known myths. These are:

1) A further punishment for Prometheus than the one he is already undergoing; 311–3, 992 ff., 1015 ff., 1080 ff., 992 ff. This is spoken of only in terms of a terrible storm, together with an earthquake or volcanic eruption. Prometheus is, however, immortal and indestructible. Nothing is said of a long period of punishment of another kind. At the same time, this seems to indicate something more radically different than the addition to his present pains caused by the eagle feeding upon his liver (*Theogony* 523–5), which would have been a legitimate inference from 311–3. A further punishment of Prometheus would probably take the line explained in 347 ff., in the description (without strict external connection) of the burden of Atlas in the west and of Typhos buried under Aetna. Bapp (Roscher iii 2, 3042) points the illuminating parallel between Typhos under Aetna and Prometheus under a Caucasus believed volcanic. Atlas is Prometheus' brother in the *Theogony* (l. 509), and his other brother,

Menoetius, was there sent down to Erebus (1. 515). Compare the fate of the Titans in general who warred on Olympus (*Theog.* 617 ff.; 729 ff.; 814). Hesiod does not say where Prometheus was confined, except that he gives the story of the eagle feeding on his liver (*Theog.* 523 ff.). This would be conceivable in misty Tartarus; hardly under a mountain. Hesiod's uncertainty probably accounts for Aeschylus' inclusion of the suggestive passage 347–76. Thus both from the *Theogony* and from Aeschylus himself we get the answer to the question of what further punishment can be meted out to Prometheus. As to a distinction between being buried under a mountain, and confined in Tartarus, both Aeschylus and Hesiod are undoubtedly hazy (note especially *P. V.* 1043–53), but the hearers would derive no confusion from these poems that did not already exist in their own minds.

2) A possible deliverance of Prometheus far in the future. No less than three quite independent myths are brought to bear on this point. All are presented in fragmentary, allusive form and would have no point at all unless they referred to stories already known.

a) The oracle about Thetis and Zeus. This is the most muddled of the three. The gist of it appears (764):

γαμεῖ γάμον τοιοῦτον ὥ ποτ' ἀσχαλῷ.
768 ή τέξεται γε παῖδα φέρτερον πατρός.

So 909–10

γάμον γαμεῖν ὅς αὐτὸν ἐκ τυραννίδος
θρόνων τ' ἄιστον ἐκβαλεῖ.

This is explained in Pind. *I.* viii 28 ff. Zeus and Poseidon contend for the hand of Thetis, but are deterred by Themis, who tells them that Thetis is fated to bear a son—φέρτερον γόνον ἄνακτα πατρός. These two references point, if not to a single epic poem, at least to a widely current tradition of the early fifth century. The pronouncement in Aeschylus affects both Thetis and Zeus; that in Pindar merely says that Thetis will bear a son greater than his father. But Aeschylus, or Prometheus, is not consistent here. 755–6:

‘ νῦν οὐδέν ἔστι τέρμα μοι προκείμενον
μόχθων πρὶν ἀν Ζεὺς ἐκπέση τυραννίδος.

The predictions following are in the uncompromising future tense.

Prometheus, that is, knows that Zeus will be overthrown and trusts to come into his rights in the general revolution. And yet, a little later—769—we read:

"Ιω, οὐδ' ἔστιν αὐτῷ τῆσδ' ἀποστροφὴ τύχης;

Πρ. οὐ δῆτα, πλὴν ἔγωγ' ἂν ἐκ δεσμῶν λυθεῖς.

and in 913 (Cf. 167 ff.):

τοιῶνδε μόχθων ἐκτροπὴν οὐδεὶς θεῶν
δύναται' ἂν αὐτῷ πλὴν ἐμοῦ δεῖξαι σαφῶς.

This means that, taken strictly, the decree of fate is identical with that in Pindar; it concerns primarily Thetis, and Zeus is at liberty to put himself under it or not. Thus there are two strata to the *corpus* of inside information which Prometheus has received from his mother: 1) the unalterable decree that Thetis' son will be better than his father; 2) the incomplete foreknowledge that Zeus will one day seek Thetis, in marriage, and will get her if he fails to find out about the fate of her offspring. This situation is absurd, and unthinkable in any one connected mythological account. Thus it shows clearly that, as Wilamowitz says (*Aesch. Inter.*, p. 134; cf. Weil, *Études*, p. 74 ff.), the connection between the marriage of Thetis and Prometheus was invented by Aeschylus and is purely for dramatic purposes. It is necessary, because some such device alone can give Prometheus a real hold on Zeus and make a counter-action.

b) Liberation by Heracles. This was part of the Heracles saga (Bapp *ap.* Roscher, iii² 3043; Wilam., *l.c.*, p. 132), a bit of which found its way into the *Theogony*, 526–34, where it is inconsistent with *Theog.* 616, which leaves Prometheus bound. The motive given is Zeus' desire to glorify his son (530 ff.), and Prometheus is pardoned. An echo of this appears in *P. V.* 259:

Χο. οὐδ' ἔστιν ἄθλου τέρμα σοι προκείμενον;

Πρ. οὐκ ἄλλο γ' οὐδέν, πλὴν ὅταν κείνῳ δοκῆ,

before the real themes of the play have been more than alluded to (101–3, 167 ff.). In 772 ff., 871 ff., Prometheus refers to his own actual deliverer. He will be of the thirteenth generation from Io in direct descent, and will be a famous archer. The audience knew from the first reference who the deliverer would be, not perhaps because they knew that Heracles appeared in the thirteenth generation from Io in some non-Attic epos, but because he was the only deliverer of Prometheus. This is fairly well settled by the *τόξοισι κλεινός* 872.

c) Cheiron. Up to line 1006, Prometheus has been threatening, and declaring his own conditions of peace with Zeus. In 1026-9 Hermes imposes a counter condition from the constituted authority:

τοιοῦδε μόχθου τέρμα μή τι προσδόκα,
πρὶν ἂν θεῶν τις διάδοχος τῶν σῶν πόνων
φανῆ, θελήσῃ τ' εἰς ἀναγητὸν μολεῖν
"Αἰδην κνεφαῖα τ' ἄμφι Ταρτάρου βάθη.

For an explanation of this we have to take refuge in Apollodorus, (a), ii 5, 4, 5; (b) ii 5, 11, 10; in (a) the centaur Cheiron, wounded incurably, descends into Hades and gives up his immortality to Prometheus; in (b) a formal transfer takes place on the Caucasus under circumstances corresponding to those of the fragments of *Prometheus Lyomenos*. Cheiron need not have been present, but Heracles πάρεσχε τῷ Διὶ Χείρωνα θυήσκειν . . . θέλοντα. The olive wreath, which, teste Athenaeo 674 D, appeared in the *Prometheus Lyomenos*, appears here. For lack of other evidence we must refer Cheiron (as Wilamowitz, *Inter.*, p. 132), to the Heracles saga, from which Aeschylus drew the freeing of Prometheus. This was of Thessalian origin, like the story of the death on Mt. Oeta. Note the places mentioned by Apollodorus, ii 5, 4; also the Centaurs; Heracles armed with bow and arrows instead of a club, in *P. V.* 872 and *Theog.* 526-34, a version current when Aeschylus wrote. Possibly it was followed by Pherecydes, who told of the shooting of the eagle. See *Schol. Ap. Rh.* ii 1249; iv 1346.

A further question suggested by a review of the sources is whether or not Prometheus was represented as chained on the top of a mountain, where he could converse with divinities of the air and sea, in any version previous to Aeschylus' plays. The *Theogony* leaves the place of confinement obscure; of the two Apollodorus passages about Cheiron, the one representing the act of Heracles is clearly drawn from the *Prometheus Lyomenos*. Horace (*Odes*, ii 13, 37), speaks of Prometheus suffering with Tantalus in the underworld, and (*Epodes*, xvii 67) names him, beside Tantalus and Sisyphus, as Prometheus "obligatus aliti." This seems at least a parallel for a Prometheus suffering in the underworld, with the bird of prey. An answer to this question would require, beside a thorough review of the later sources for

Prometheus, a reconstruction of the contents of the Heracles epic or epics from which Stesichorus in the *Geryoneis*, Pherecydes, Aeschylus, and possibly even Hesiod, drew.

The *Prometheus* is interesting as being a primitive attempt at suspense of objective issue by means of several different possibilities. Thus the further punishment for Prometheus, the possible marriage between Thetis and Zeus, the rescue by Heracles, and the substitution of Cheiron, are severally presented without any considerable attempt to correlate them with each other. The mind, therefore, of the reader or hearer is reduced to a state of inextricable confusion. The work to a degree resembles some early Flemish painting, which combines almost preternatural insight and splendor of detail with imperfect composition and perspective.

SUMMARY.

It will be seen from the foregoing that too detailed a classification of the methods used to produce suspense from mythological confusion or certainty, is impracticable. Methods spring naturally out of individual plots and connect themselves with literary and dramatic devices, such as delays, stage business, conflicts of will, and so forth.

It appears, however, that mythological suspense tends rather clearly to divide into two classes, that of *anticipation* and that of *uncertainty*.

In suspense of *anticipation* the issue is known beforehand either through something said in the prologue or by the unanimity of familiar tradition. Here the poet's duty is to complicate the means to the end so that it seems remote and difficult, however inevitable (as in Eur. *El.*), or to lead up to it by a series of powerful suggestions (as in *Oed. Tyr.*), so that the paradox of inevitability and unfulfilment dangles momentarily before our eyes. Sometimes suspense of anticipation as to the one issue may be reinforced by suspense of uncertainty as to: a) another secondary issue, as in *Agamemnon*, where there is certainty as to the death, uncertainty as to the weapon; or in *Choephoroe*, which shows certainty as to the death of Clytaemestra and Aegisthus, uncertainty as to order and relative importance of the two deaths; or,

b) a subsequent issue, as in *Iph. Taur.*, where there is certainty as to the anagnorisis, uncertainty as to the fate of the captives.

That suspense of anticipation was not considered simply a disagreeable makeshift is shown by the treatment of the *Ion*. In the *Ion*, the content of the anagnorisis is given, in a divinely uttered prologue, and the recognition of Ion by Xuthus as his heir is there predicted. This makes a foregone conclusion of the entire play down through 675, but leaves suspense (with the reservation noted *s.v. Ion*) of Creusa's attempt on the lives of Xuthus and Ion, and of her immediate recognition of her boy. Greek tragedies began with one simple episode and expanded later into two or several simple, successive episodes. We have not extant, until the *Iph. Aul.*, a modern drama of intrigue, in which one complicated issue makes an entire play. In the *Ion*, therefore, suspense of anticipation appears side by side with that of uncertainty, as a recognized dramatic device.

We have seen suspense of anticipation developed by the following means:

1) Delaying the introduction of a theme known to be part of the story: *Rhesus*.

2) Increasing the emphasis on some one character: Athena in *Aias*.

3) Developing by suggestion and a progressive, uninterrupted action the expectation of a certain event known from the saga: *Bacchae*, *Heracleidae*, *Phoenissae*, *Septem*, Euripides' *Supplices*, *Aias*, *Agamemnon*, Sophocles' *Electra*, Euripides' *Electra*, *Chœphoroe*, *Cyclops*, *Troïades*, *Oedipus Tyrannus*, *Persæ*, *Andromache*.

4) Introducing a matter of common belief, like the burial of a hero: *Heracles* (Heracles at Athens), *Heracleidae*, *Aias* (burial of Aias), *Medea* (Medea at Athens), *Orestes*, *Eumenides* (survival of Orestes), *Ion* (Ion as eponymous hero), *Helen* (Helen and Menelaus at Sparta), *Oedipus Coloneus*, *Phoenissae* (Oedipus at Athens).

5) Using a conventional theme not peculiar to the story in hand, with a certain stock conclusion: Suppliance—Aeschylus' *Supplices*, *Andromache*, *Heracles*, *Helen*, *Heracleidae*, Euripides' *Supplices*: Willing sacrifice—*Iphigeneia Aulidensis*, *Hecabe*, *Phoenissae*, *Alecestis*, *Heracleidae*, Euripides' *Supplices*; Stupid barbarian and clever Greek—*Helen*, *Iphigeneia Taurica*.

6) Echoes of other plays: *Heracles*, *Andromache*, Euripides' *Electra*, (Polymestor in the *Hecabe*), *Helen*, (*Iphigeneia Taurica*).

Suspense of uncertainty is assumed to be the normal form of modern dramatic suspense, and in the Greek tragedies we see it in process of development. In the extant plays we can watch it growing from a simple ritual motive like Aeschylus' *Supplices* or from an historical pageant like the *Persae*, where every conclusion is foregone, through stages like the *Eumenides* and *Oedipus Tyrannus*, where a simple uncertainty is stated and worked out, to a complicated drama of intrigue like the *Iphigeneia Taurica* or *Orestes*, where the audience could be sure of nothing. When the methods of these latter plays were transferred to manufactured middle class characters, there arose New Comedy, where the audience had no clue to the outcome. But suspense of uncertainty in New Comedy labored under two disadvantages: 1) the compulsion of the situation, where the hero had to marry the heroine, and the stray girl had to be recognized as the pluto-crat's long-lost daughter; 2) the demand for a happy ending. This is seen, for example, in Plautus' *Captivi* and *Rudens*, where the author thinks so little of suspense of uncertainty as to outline his whole plot in the prologue with more fulness than appears in any extant play of Euripides.

A moment's reflexion will show us that so far from being unusual in modern and contemporary drama, this lack of real uncertainty characterizes a large type of comedy-melodramas from *As You Like It* and *Minna von Barnhelm* to *'Way Down East*. In fact it is often only by some rather forced and not always convincing development of alternatives, that real uncertainty can be brought into a play at all. If the compulsion of the saga was strong in the ancient drama, the compulsion of mood is strong in ours. The conclusion is that in the developed Greek tragedy of 415-400 B.C. there was very little, if any, less suspense of objective issue than in our stage.

The following means were noted of creating suspense of uncertainty:

1) Changing the order of events so that a known situation points to an unknown outcome: Odysseus and Diomedes in *Rhesus*; burial of Polyneices in *Antigone*.

2) Altering or introducing details of incident or description: *Rhesus*; *Philoctetes* (Lemnos a desert), *Cyclops*, *Agamemnon* (sword or ax, fire-beacon), *Choephoroe*, Sophocles' *Electra*, Euripides' *Electra*.

3) Altering emphasis on a character so as to make his rôle in the story seem to differ from the accepted saga: *Rhesus* (Rhesus), *Agamemnon* (Aegisthus), *Iphigencia Aulidensis* (Achilles).

4) Working in a story new or unfamiliar: *Hecabe*, *Eumenides*, *Orestes*, *Iphigeneia Taurica*, *Helen*, *Antigone* (Haemon), Euripides' *Supplices* (Euadne), *Ion*.

5) Giving a special function to the chorus: *Philoctetes*, *Iphigeneia Aulidensis*.

6) Introducing a non-dramatic theme: *Iphigeneia Taurica* (willing sacrifice). Usually this presupposes the end, but here the end is the opposite of what we expect of the willing-sacrifice theme.

7) Developing a novel situation with inner suspense of its own: *Oedipus Tyrannus*, *Andromache*, *Oedipus Coloneus*.

8) Combining two or more previously unconfated myths about the same characters: *Philoctetes*, *Prometheus*, and probably the *Trachiniae* and *Heracles*.

U.C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES



C005476397

RETURN TO → CIRCULATION DEPARTMENT
202 Main Library

LOAN PERIOD 1 HOME USE	2	3
4	5	6

ALL BOOKS MAY BE RECALLED AFTER 7 DAYS

Renewals and Recharges may be made 4 days prior to the due date.
Books may be Renewed by calling 642-3405.

DUE AS STAMPED BELOW

AUTO DISC JUN 17 1988	Jan 22	
FEB 05 1989	Feb 22	
AUTO DISC.	M, 26	
DEL 1, 1988	APR 10	
CIRCULATION	MAY 24	
JUL 05 1989	JUL 29	
MAY 31 1989	MARISC JUL 07 1990	
NOV 1 1989		
OCT 21		

FORM NO. DD6,

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY
BERKELEY, CA 94720

